DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 042 UD 011 176

AUTHOR	Fantini, Mario D.
TITLE	The Reform of Urban Schools. Schools for the 70's, Preliminary Series.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Center for the Study of Instruction.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	99p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication-Sales Section, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Cloth: $3.25; Paper: $1.75)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Involvement, Community Schools, Decision Making, Disadvantaged Youth, *Free Choice Transfer Programs, Parent School Relationship, *Public Education, *Public Schools, Public School Systems, School Community Relationship, *Urban Education, *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

In this book, an overall analysis of the urban crisis is presented and concrete suggestions are made for renewing urban education through a unique design called the "public-schools-of-choice system." Fundamentally a plan in which a range of optional school programs would be offered to diverse student groups in every community, the public schools of choice would open up a range of educational opportunity and choice so far available mainly to students attending private schools. It is not a voucher plan that is suggested; new kinds of public schools are called for. In a plea for a new approach to educational decision making which involves direct participation by all concerned parties of interest--parents, students, teachers, administrators--it is deemed necessary to open up the structure of public education to a whole new range of ideas. Several programs already in existence are discussed--such as a community-centered school, a school without walls, and an academic prep school. (JW)

ED0 47042

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE REFORM OF URBAN SCHOOLS

Mario D. Fantini
Program Officer
Public Education
The Ford Foundation

UD011176

SCHOOLS FOR THE 70'S

Published by the National Education Association
Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI)

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE
AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES.
MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION
ONLY.

PRELIMINARY SERIES 1

**PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE
AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES.
MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION
ONLY.**

Copyright © 1970
National Education Association

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 71-137428

Single copy: paperbound, $1.75 (Stock No. 381-11950); clothbound, $3.25 (Stock No. 381-11952). Discounts on quantity orders: 2-9 copies, 10 percent; 10 or more copies, 20 percent. All orders must be prepaid except for those on official purchase order forms. Order from Publications-Sales Section, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

CONTENTS

Foreword 1

About the Author 3

1. Introduction: Diagnosis 5

2. Where We Have Been—What We Have Learned: An Education Agenda for the 70's and Beyond 9

3. The Participants of Reform—Students, Parents, and Teachers 21

4. Utilizing the Participants as Reform Energy 33

5. Governance, Substance, and Personnel 39

6. Public Participation—Criticism and Justification 51

7. Participation by the Teacher in Instructional Decision Making 63

8. Model Subsystems: The Case of the Madison Area Project 69

9. Toward Public Schools of Choice 91

FOREWORD

As we enter the 70's, all Americans are concerned about the deteriorating quality of life in our large cities and the crisis in urban schools. In this volume, *The Reform of Urban Schools,* Mario Fantini not only presents a penetrating analysis of the urban crisis but also makes concrete suggestions for renewing urban education through a unique design that he calls the public-schools-of-choice system. Fundamentally a plan in which a range of optional school programs would be offered to diverse student groups in every community, the public schools of choice would open up a range of educational opportunity and choice in public schools heretofore available mainly to the privileged patrons of private schools. It is important to note that Fantini is not suggesting a voucher plan. Rather he is calling for new kinds of *public* schools.

For teachers, Fantini's volume opens up a whole new world. Teachers have too long been shackled by the constraints of standard institutional organization. These restraining forces have virtually forced them to put into practice decisions made by others far from the students and the life of the school. As Fantini puts it, "Closest to the learner, the teacher is farthest from instructional decision making."

On a positive note, the author argues that as agents closest to the action, teachers are in a logical position to assume major responsibility for making instructional policies and putting them into action. He suggests ways to begin to move forward into a new world of professional stature and responsibility. Not every teacher who reads this book will agree with all the author has to say, but no one who reads this book will ever look at his job again in precisely the same way.

In a plea for a new approach to educational decision making that involves direct participation by all concerned parties of interest—teachers, administrators, students, and parents—Fantini would open up the structure of public education to a whole new range of ideas. Behind his approach is the reasoned acknowledgment that while the standard public school system might still be acceptable for the majority of its users, we are now confronting a critical mass of discontented students and parents for whom the public schools are no longer acceptable. These "consumers" of education are demanding reform at a time when education is crucial to their own survival and to that of society. Unless our public schools are revitalized and reform realized soon, it is not an exaggeration to say that the entire structure of American life may give way. What has happened is that we are entering a new educational era with an outmoded educational institution that is unable to meet its huge obligation to individuals, groups, and society.

Fantini's public-schools-of-choice system would transform the usual standardized, monolithic offering of most public school programs into a broad range of educational options for diverse populations in each school community. Fantini mentions seven different types of programs already in existence that might be made available, ranging from a classical academic prep school, to a community-centered school, to a school without walls. Management and direction of public schools of choice would be by cooperative governance of those parties most directly concerned with the educational process—teachers, administrators, students, and parents.

The Reform of Urban Schools is one of several volumes in the Preliminary Series of NEA's SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's program, a major publication and action program underway at NEA's Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI). The 70's program has three parts. The first is a comprehensive, single-volume report, with accompanying multimedia and action programs addressed to all members of the profession and the public. The second, which includes this volume, is a Preliminary Series focused on critical issues. The third is an Auxiliary Series that includes four volumes already off the press addressed primarily to curriculum specialists and university and school researchers. The entire SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's program is more than just a series of books. It underlines anew NEA's continuing commitment to promote instructional improvement in the light of new priorities and imperatives.

Helen Bain
President
National Education Association
September 1970

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

The name Mario D. Fantini is synonymous with commitment to the reform of urban education. The breadth and depth of his experience with the problems of city schools is well known, and his dedication to making city schools work has produced both concrete and abstract models for educators to study in approaching urban problems nationwide.

In late 1964 and early 1965, Dr. Fantini served as a consultant to the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation, where he directed a project to identify and record effective teaching practices with disadvantaged elementary school children. In May 1965, he joined the regular staff of the Ford Foundation where he is a program officer. Additionally, in May 1967, Dr. Fantini was appointed executive secretary of Mayor Lindsay's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City Schools and became staff director of the Bundy Report *(Reconnection for Learning: A Community School System for New York City).* In 1968, he was appointed by President Johnson as a member of the National Advisory Council of Supplementary Centers and Services (Title III). In addition to his position with the Ford Foundation, he is serving as consultant to the Task Force on Urban Education, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.; as consultant, NDEA Institute for Advanced Study of Teaching Disadvantaged Youth; as chief consultant to the $10,000,000 Model Demonstration School Project (Anacostia Community School Project) and Fort Lincoln-New Town, both in Washington, D.C.; and as a member of the Commission on Goals in American Education, ASCD, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Fantini, a native of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, completed his undergraduate work and earned his master's degree at Temple University in an experimental Ford Foundation program. In 1960 he earned a Certificate for Advanced Study in Educational Administration from Harvard University, and in 1961 Harvard granted him his doctorate in education. He has worked extensively in the field and in the classroom teaching urban youth as well as mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed children. He also acted as chairman of experimental teacher-training programs at Temple. From 1962 to 1964, Dr. Fantini served as senior research associate at Syracuse University, as director of the Madison Area Project in Syracuse, N.Y., which is described in this volume, and as director of the Urban Teacher Preparation Program at Syracuse University.

His long list of published works include *Toward a Contact Curriculum*, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1967 (co-authored by Gerald Weinstein); *Designing Education for Tomorrow's Cities*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970 (co-authored by Milton Young); *Community Control and the Urban School*, Praeger, 1970 (co-authored with Marylin Gittell and Richard Magat); *Toward Humanistic Education*, Praeger, 1970 (co-authored by Gerald Weinstein); *The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education*, Harper & Row, 1968 (co-authored with Gerald Weinstein); and *Making Urban Schools Work*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968 (co-authored with Gerald Weinstein). The latter two were included in a selection of 21 outstanding books of 1968 by *Educational Books of 1968*, and were chosen as outstanding educational books of 1968 by Pi Lambda Theta.

1. Introduction: Diagnosis

Before something called "the Urban Crisis" became the longest running problem in the nation, the city represented the most sophisticated, civilized aspirations of modern man. Horatio Alger left home for it; stowaways huddled in bleak corners of ships for the promise of city lights; metropolitan America was the talk of Greek Islanders, the whispers overheard in small cafes. All that was golden and alluring seemed to dwell in the cities of the United States, and millions of hopeful immigrants scrambled for visas. They scrambled for excitement, for decency, for financial stability and opportunity.

Decades later, American cities have overgrown into unwieldy, unmanageable seas of frustration. Between 1950 and 1959, there was a 1.5 percent population increase in American cities, as compared with a 44 percent increase in the suburbs. Suburbia, the retreat of the middle class, is a temporary phenomenon; by the year 1980, 9 out of 10 Americans will be urban dwellers. By the turn of this century, there will be no place left to hide from the urban environments we have created; they will be an unrelenting, unavoidable way of life for the 21st century American.

Urban school systems, which once represented America's finest, are now trapped in a spiral of deterioration. As measured by the effects on children, city schools are failing. For example, in a survey recently completed by the Citizen's Committee for Children in New York, joining countless other studies, it was reported that of 65,203 students admitted to the class that would graduate from high school in 1968, only 60.5 percent finished the public schools. Only 30 percent of the original "class" finished with an academic or college-preparatory diploma.

All citizens are paying a heavy price for this decline—reflected in the dramatic upsurge of drug use, crime, welfare, rehabilitation, and student unrest. But the most obvious victims are the casualties themselves, found mainly (but not exclusively) in those parts of the city that need education most desperately—the low-income neighborhoods. The poor in our big cities have little choice but the public schools, and in the absence of successful schooling, the poor are expressing their frustration in the form of apathy on the one hand and rebellion on the other. The consumers of public education—parents and students alike—are in increasing revolt against the system's failure, a failure that will trap them unmercifully in the cycle of poverty: poor education, to low paying jobs, to poor housing, to poor instruction, to poor education, and so on.

It is not possible to discuss urban education as a problem peculiar to some Americans. Urban education is American education. The urban context of today and tomorrow is one of almost continuous stress imposed by intensely concentrated social pressures—loss of identity, bureaucracy and feelings of powerlessness, density and diversity of population, and feelings of disconnectedness.[1] In our own lifetime, we have seen relatively simple social atmospheres become complicated by increased population or polarized interest groups. We have seen small towns divided by public swimming pools, a black man buying a house, a high school cheerleader moving into the East Village (the community of rebellious youth in New York City).

Complexity, whether good or evil, is a fact of our times. There are those who hesitate to relinquish the safe and undemanding nature of a simple life, and one cannot blame them entirely. But there is virtually no way of returning to the days of easy answers, and it is dangerously naive to suppose that complexity is the result of a conspiracy. (Following such reasoning, you could get back "the good old days" by seizing the conspirators.)

Educational systems can be simple designs in a society of easy answers. Puritan America did not have to search for an ethical code to pass on to its children. Single-purpose societies need not flounder for educational objectives; China and Cuba, for example, know in very specific terms what they mean by productive, useful citizens. Hitler had no difficulty envisioning an educational system. Some nations are in the beginning stages of growth, fresh from revolutions and requiring popular allegiance for development:

> . . . in a revolutionary society (i.e., a society in the process of cultural transformation under the leadership of a revitalization

---

[1] Fantini, Mario, and Weinstein, Gerald. *Making Urban Schools Work.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

> movement) the primary concern of schools must be the *moral* transformation of the population. Next in order of priority will be intellect; and last of all, technic (despite the often critical needs for technically trained personnel to carry out the program of the transfer culture). The reason for this priority list—morality, intellect, and technic—is that the moral rebirth of the population and the development of a cadre of morally reliable and intellectually resourceful individuals to take over executive positions throughout the society is the immediate necessary task.[2]

The United States has already embarked on her "preservationist" stage, seeking to protect and defend the society that has already developed and the institutions within it. The frenetic progress of only two centuries, however, has produced gigantic discrepancies between the reality of modern America and our ability to deal with it. In many ways, our schools are still preparing children for rural, spacious living, and delivering the old easy answers even though the questions have changed. For example, our present summer vacation period is a carryover from the agrarian harvest time when children were needed to lend important arms to the farming chores. The institutions we are conserving are overwhelmingly and harmfully obsolete. The child educated in the classical Western tradition is given the values of peace, harmony, justice, order, beauty. How likely is he to find those elements in Harlem or downtown Chicago? "It is an accepted fact that neuroses develop when an environment makes it impossible for a person to achieve the ambitions and goals that he has been taught in youth to believe are within his grasp, if only he sincerely strives." [3]

What is wrong with our city schools has been discussed, argued, belabored beyond endurance. The horror of urban education is a popular theme of the media, National Book Award winners, ladies' luncheons, and cocktail parties. In this volume you will find fewer answers than questions and certainly no wall-to-wall solution or blanket cure for "death at an early age." Consider the eminent school superintendent who recently described his visits to three predominantly black schools in the city where he works. He claimed that he does not dare walk down the corridors of those schools in New York City where policemen patrol the halls. It is time to close the curtain on documentaries and to translate overworked jargon into practice. Surely we have come far enough to know that learning cannot take place in an armed camp. Or do we need guerrilla warfare to convince us?

---

[2] Wallace, Anthony F. C. "Schools in Revolution and Conservative Societies." *Anthropology and Education.* (Edited by George D. Spindler.) Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1955. p. 43.

[3] Higbee, Edward. *The Squeeze: Cities Without Space.* New York: Apollo Editions, 1960. p. 10.

For while the standard public school system continues to be acceptable for the majority of its users, this majority has dwindled. In fact, we now have a critical mass of discontented educational consumers (students and parents) for whom the public schools are no longer a viable choice. They are demanding reform at a time when education is crucial to their own survival and to that of society. Unless reform is realized soon, the entire fabric of our real society will be in serious trouble. We are entering a new age of education but we have entered with an outmoded institution to meet its obligation to society, groups, and the individual. The educational institution—public schools—must be revitalized. The problems seem, and indeed are, most acute in our urban centers. But in a country that is already urban, solving the crisis in urban education is solving the problem of public education.

2. Where We Have Been – What We Have Learned: An Education Agenda for the 70's and Beyond

The two most significant events that sparked the recent reassessment of educational policy were Russia's Sputnik and our own Civil Rights movement. The 1950's produced the slogan "curriculum lag," and our political fear of "falling behind" precipitated the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA). That decade initiated an unprecedented era of federal concern for public education, and as a policy statement, the NDEA reinforced the need for better schools. Suddenly, science and mathematics were instruments of national defense, and the education business catapulted almost overnight. Research and development centers multiplied; new techniques for teaching were explored. Complacency concerning the quality of American schools was replaced suddenly with challenge and inquiry. Parent-teacher groups were activated, and money was invested for educational innovation.

The federal legislation of 1958, 1964, and 1965 launched us on a journey to rehabilitate the schools. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 fostered economic assistance in urban areas because cities seemed to contain the largest proportion of poor people. Educational administrators in slum areas were showered with promises and subsequent gifts of funds. Although the inadequacy of city schools had certainly existed prior to 1965, urban education became a national issue as a result of the accelerated attention.

In the 60's, therefore, we identified the crises in urban schools and quickly mounted programs of action.

If we are to profit from the valuable educational experience of the 60's and not repeat some costly errors, we must develop a new set of guiding assumptions for the 70's and beyond. The educational activities of the 60's, whether federal, state, or local, were based on a set of assumptions developed largely as a reaction to crash programs dealing with the poor—i.e., people classified euphemistically as "disadvantaged."

THREE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE 1960's

Compensatory Education

The first assumption of the 60's had to do with the nature of the educational problem. The use of such terms as *culturally deprived* or *culturally disadvantaged* carried with it the notion that there was something wrong with the learner—with his cultural and environmental background, not with the school and its educational process. In short, we assumed that the problem was with the student rather than the school, with the client rather than the institution.

With such a diagnosis, it made sense to mount programs of compensatory education, programs that focused on the remediation of the "disadvantaged" learner with the aim of rehabilitating him to fit the existing school. Most of our federal programs of intervention—most notably Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—were compensatory in nature, attempting to get learners to adjust to schools rather than the other way around.

The compensatory strategy seemed revolutionary at the time of its inception, but in retrospect it seems only mildly reformative. The exorbitant, extensive activities of the last five years have been primarily additive. They supply neither a revised foundation nor a changed model for educating American children; they simply pile new layers onto an old, weary framework. In many ways the recent era of compensatory education has served to reinforce the original theory of adaptation and adjustment to middle-class society. While both Project Head Start and Upward Bound have been conducted *outside* the regular system as preparatory sessions for subsequent school experience, in effect these efforts are appendages to the standard education system.

The results of the "gap-filling" devices have been discouraging indeed. Although youngsters have demonstrated appreciation for the extra attention, their later academic performance has not proved to be substantially different. Data from Higher Horizons, the Great Cities Project, and More Effective Schools confirm the ultimate impotence of compensatory programs. Recently, the First National City Bank conducted a study which concluded that reading progress among Puerto Rican and black students in New York City has little correlation with the amount of money spent per child.[1]

---

[1] *New York Times*, November 25, 1969. p. 41.

It was not until the latter part of the 60's that we began to raise questions about compensatory education. Reports from the field began to show results that were not encouraging. President Nixon's 1970 message on education acknowledged that "the best available evidence indicates that most of the compensatory education programs have not measurably helped poor children catch up."

The results of compensatory education suggest strongly that any appropriate assumption for the 70's shifts the problem from the learner to the institution. The problem is *institutional obsolescence.* We are asking the standard school, forged in the 19th century, to solve 20th and 21st century problems. The schools as they presently function cannot meet the challenge of contemporary universal public education. The schools as major social institutions simply do not have the capacity to deal with *diversity.* We are asking public schools to become the major instrument for solving many of our social ills—poverty, racism, alienation, powerlessness—and also to respond to the manpower needs of an advanced technological society. In short, we have given public education a mission for which it presently is not prepared. Faced with these growing demands, schoolmen have responded the only way they could—through an add-on strategy, building on layers to the standard educational structure while at the same time keeping the present system running. We have added vocational education, special education, adult education, and early childhood education, and each has remained separated from the other.

The result over the years is that the total educational system has become ponderous and unresponsive to the growing aspirations of those who use schools. The basic charge for the 70's, therefore, is institutional reform.

Though the most visible victims of institutional obsolescence are the poor, *all* children are disadvantaged as the products of archaic schools; misguidance and distorted notions know no economic class.[2] If a scientist were to suggest modifying a Boeing 707 for space travel, he would not survive too long in the laboratory. Yet, the recent activity of educational reform has been based on a similar fallacy of "tinkering" with the available mechanism; the money is squandered, the national frenzy mushrooms, and the fundamental problems persist.

---

[2] For an expanded presentation of this view, see: Fantini, Mario, and Weinstein, Gerald. *The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education.* New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

More Money

A second major assumption of the 60's was that more money was needed for public school improvement. While on the surface this does not appear to be a fallacious assumption, it becomes so when more money is used to do more of the same thing. When, for example, more money is used for more reading teachers, more counselors, more psychologists who try to rehabilitate the learner to adjust to the conventional school, then "new" money is used in old ways. Federal "seed" money made available to public education in the 60's was new money which should have been used in *new* ways to explore more effective ways to use the old money.

We have been pouring money into an outdated system. If we continue, we shall merely end up with an improved, outdated educational system. Putting more money into the present system is like putting money into an old car—after a point, one reaches the stage of diminishing returns. Most urban schools are well into this stage.

In New York City, for example, the school system doubled its educational budget in less than a decade. Taking into account inflation and rising costs, the doubling of expenditures has produced no significant difference in results. We assume, for instance, that we should continue to build schoolhouses. The Parkway Program in Philadelphia—the School Without Walls—uses the city as a campus and saves the school district $15 million on construction costs alone. Moreover, TV programs such as *Sesame Street* may point the way to more economical and pleasurable approaches to basic skill-making for young children than the drab, conventional approach to basic skills practiced in most schools today.

The question for the 70's must be, More money for what? Assumptions undergirding the fiscal policies for the 70's must center on the effects or results of various conceptions of education; given the same per-pupil cost, what are the results of different educational approaches?

Rise of the Consumer

A third assumption of the last decade had to do with the notion that the only legitimate party of interest in education was the professional educator—usually the administrator. It was his responsibility to decide how the money was to be spent. However, the 60's also saw the rise of the parties closest to the teaching front—teachers, students, and parents. The 70's will see these major parties of interest acquire a louder voice in educational decision making. Consequently, the thinking of the 70's must emphasize the consumers of schools—parents and students—as well as teachers and administrators. Basic to this idea is that the *process* of education is as important as the product. The parties of interest must be connected in a search for quality education. Ideas, however sound, cannot be superimposed on others. Doing something *for* or *to* others must be replaced by doing something *with* others.

In effect, the realignment of the participants in public education promises to produce richer yields for all:

1. For learners, a school system responsive to their needs, resonant with their personal style, and affirmative in its expectations of them.
2. For parents, a tangible grasp of the destiny of their children and the beginnings of richer meaning for their own lives.
3. For professionals, surcease from an increasingly negative community climate and, even more positively, new allies in their task.

APPROACHES TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Although some of the educational assumptions of the 60's proved to be misleading, they engendered approaches to school improvement that are likely to continue into the 70's and beyond. Some of these approaches may eventually be successful, while others, if they continue to rest on false assumptions, will not produce the needed improvements.

Desegregation

Since the 1954 Supreme Court decision, considerable effort toward integration has been based on the assumption that Negro pupils' achievement is enhanced in an integrated school environment. The Coleman Report tends to support this view, and the U.S. Civil Rights Commission is unequivocal in stating that "Negro children suffer serious harm when their education takes place in public schools which are racially segregated, whatever the source of such segregations may be. Negro children who attend predominantly Negro schools do not achieve as well as other children, Negro or white."[3]

The frustration felt by black students has resulted in a growing shift of emphasis by minority group members themselves away from desegregation as created by the white majority. A new focus of increased numbers of racial-minority parents is on power and control over the schools that their children attend. The changing mood springs not only from the poor record of integration efforts, but also from a revolt against the condescension perceived by minority group members in the school desegregation efforts of the post-1954 decade. First, many of them resent the fact that integration is, under current power arrangements, an option of the white community. Second, they believe that the dependent status of the Negro in American society is perpetuated by the notion that the only way to help the black child is to seat him alongside white children. Beneath this mood is a quest for stronger racial identity and pride and a desire to gain more control of their own destiny. Many Negro spokesmen say that the desire for integration was based, rather, on the belief that parents in predominantly white schools exercised enough power to ensure that their schools offered finer education, in which Negro pupils could share. The converse is powerlessness, further destruction of identity, and increasing disconnection from the larger society.

The implication for public education is greater participation by Negroes in control of predominantly Negro schools. This is rather different from the "separate but equal" doctrine, since some "black power" philosophers reason that when Negroes achieve successful education under their own aegis, they will then be prepared to connect (integrate) with the white society on a groundwork of parity instead of deficiency. A good school then would be defined not by the kind of children who attend it, but by the quality of the education offered. In short, the blacks seek connection as equals.

The goals of integration must be broadened, therefore, to restore a quality that has been sidetracked in the emphasis on the academic-achievement goal of desegregation and in equating *assimilation* with integration. In other words, we must recognize that viewing diversity and differences as assets rather than unfortunate barriers to homogeneity has as positive an effect on human growth and development as the teaching of academic skills. All of which is to suggest that militant Negro demands for participation in control of public education are actually a means of promoting greater connection to society, precisely opposite from the connotations of separatism usually associated with "black power." However, integration as a path both to quality education and to a connected human society that values human worth must remain a central goal of an open society.

---

[3] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967. p. 1.

Parallel Systems

One set of approaches to better education is not really intervention in public education at all, but rather an escape into a parallel system. Such approaches assume that if the poor (or others) cannot reform public education, the system is meaningless to the poor and they should be afforded options to it.

A few privately managed schools have been established in urban ghettos, and several others are in the planning stage. Precedents for such schools exist in southern Freedom Schools (notably Neil Sullivan's school for Negro pupils deprived of educational opportunity when the Prince Edward County, Va., public schools closed to avoid integration). Some northern counterparts include Harlem's Street Academies and the New School and the Highland Park School in Boston's Roxbury section. The New York Urban League-sponsored Street Academies report sending more than 75 percent of their students—hard-core rejects from the public school system—to college.

Of considerable potential significance to urban education is an act approved by the Massachusetts Legislature late in 1967, which enables the State Department of Education to assist and sponsor experimental school systems planned, developed, and operated by private nonprofit corporations. The first of these is the Committee for Community Educational Development (CCED), which has a state school in Dorchester, Mass. Assuming a greater role in education and urban problems, states could establish yardsticks—"educational TVA's"—in order to measure the effectiveness of different forms of educational innovation.

Project Head Start schools are also "private" in the sense that they exist apart from the public school system and are not subject to its rules and regulations governing personnel, curriculum, and other matters. Some of these schools are financed under federal tuition grants and foundation funds, and efforts are being made to obtain support for others from business and industry. A special hybrid, a publicly-financed but totally independent school system (an enclave apart from the regular New York City system), with a per-capita budget received directly from the state, was proposed in 1967 by the Harlem Chapter of CORE, though it failed in the New York State Constitutional Convention.

Because nonpublic schools are free of some of the built-in restraints of large public school systems, they often operate with considerable flexibility. They do not have to deal with distant and entrenched bureaucracies, with school boards unfamiliar with their particular needs, or with powerfully organized teachers groups. They are free to hire teachers from a variety of personnel pools and to sidestep rigid credentialing procedures. Some may even modify such practices as tenure and retain, promote, or discharge teachers purely on the grounds of merit and performance. If these schools are governed by boards with a substantial representation of their pupils' parents, many people believe that they are likely to be more responsive to the children's needs and thereby encourage better rapport and partnership between the home and the school. In the most general sense, alternative schools afford the poor the choice that is open to many middle-class parents—to educate their children elsewhere if they are dissatisfied with the performance of the local public school. And if enough private schools are available, the pattern ushers in an entrepreneurial system in which parents can choose, cafeteria-style, from a range of styles of education—Montessori, prep school, Summerhill, and others.

Carried to its logical conclusion, however, the parallel-school approach would reduce the scope of public education, if not dispense with it altogether. The establishment of private schools sufficient to handle significant numbers of poor children would require public support and, in effect, establish a private system of publicly-supported schools. Middle-income parents would demand similar privileges. For financial reasons alone, the parallel-school approach is hardly likely to become widespread in the foreseeable future; moreover the scheme would flounder on political, if not constitutional, grounds. Finally, since private schools are not subject to public control, there would be no guarantee that some private education might not be organized by special interest groups for ends inimical to a free and open society. Support of such enterprises at public expense would be difficult to justify.

These arguments are, of course, no reason to discourage programs that enable more low-income pupils to attend private schools. Private schools could serve a valuable yardstick function if they were run under conditions that simulated the resources and inputs of public education—particularly comparable per-capita expenditures and admission policies that would embrace a range of low-income pupils, including the "disruptive." But that is the limit of their usefulness as an alternative to improved public education, for they could never serve the majority of the children of the poor. They remain, at present, another emerging option.

Credit for Tuition Purposes

In order to provide a family unit with the broadest possible scale of options, some have proposed that families have a credit voucher which could be used for tuition to attend various schools in an "open" market. Under this plan, a poor family would have the option of sending a child to private or public schools. Further, they could "shop around" for certain kinds of private schools. This plan would certainly tackle the problem of equalizing opportunities. It would also serve as an incentive for school systems to become more efficient through the competition that would be engendered. This plan may or may not be threatening to public schools, depending on how it is developed. This is still a relatively new option, proposed by a handful of education analysts and critics including Milton Friedman, Christopher Jencks, Ted Sizer, and Kenneth Clark.

This alternative seeks to foster reform by changing the *demand* structure of education, placing economic purchasing power directly in the hand of the parent as educational consumer. However, the *supply* side of education remains unaltered. The problem is not with demand, but with better supply capabilities for education, that is, educational alternatives from which a diverse consumer population might choose.

Total System Reform

Since the compensatory approach has apparently failed, since desegregation is not a realistic short-range prospect, since model subsystems do not yet give much evidence of realizing their promise, and since parallel systems are basically an avoidance of the challenge to reform the schools in which most children will continue to be educated, another approach to intervention is the reform of total school systems, structurally and otherwise. There are several ways of looking at total system intervention.

One approach is to provide new leadership for the system as a whole, while leaving the system's form and structure basically intact. This approach is exemplified by trends in Philadelphia, where a reform-minded central school board, including former Mayor Richardson Dilworth and a new superintendent of schools with a record of innovation, is attempting to strengthen the effectiveness of the old system with the infusion of new staff and new styles. Pittsburgh, too, is improving the efficiency of the existing system, within the operational definition of quality educational achievement according to norms. Washington, D.C., has begun moving in this direction, beginning with single model schools. The Passow Report on the District's schools recommends a total system reform by decentralizing the system into eight subsystems of approximately equal size.[4]

Still another form is the proposed merger of the school systems of two entire political jurisdictions—the city of Louisville and Jefferson County. The Louisville-Jefferson County merger differs markedly from the piecemeal metropolitan experiments noted earlier. In this case, the new metropolitan system would consist of a number of subdistricts, each with considerable autonomy yet federated into a single system to preserve the best of the worlds of bigness and smallness.

In the subsystems, models of excellence must swim against the tide of the status quo system. The total approach has no such constraint; there is no boring from within, for everyone starts at the reform gate at the same time. In a federation of autonomous subsystems, each with an equitable share of resources, instructional practices would operate in an open, competitive market. The most successful models would be on display as a challenge to other school systems to adopt their approaches or surpass them in performance.

The intervention proposed in November 1967 by the Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City Schools —the Bundy Report—adds a crucial new energy source to the total system pattern.[5] Administrative decentralization of large school systems had been in the wind for some time. (New York

---

[4] Passow, A. H. *Summary of a Report on the Washington, D.C. Public Schools.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967. (Mimeo.)

[5] Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City Schools. *Reconnection for Learning: A Community School System for New York City.* New York: Praeger Press, 1968.

City itself has for the last six years begun loosening the reins of a highly centralized system.) But the Bundy Report's proposals go well beyond administrative arrangements into a form of public engagement in the process of education that is without precedent in large urban systems and, in a sense, without much real precedent in many suburbs and small cities.

As with many other alternatives, total system reform, in which a new top executive team takes over and attempts to generate change, need not depend on participation of the clients as a major source of reform energy. Reform could be mostly an in-house attempt.

Perhaps the greatest amount of energy for school reform in the 70's will be engendered by three groups that, though vitally important to education, were heretofore at the bottom of the educational system in terms of making their voices heard. These three groups include the "consumers" of education—students and parents—and those closest to the action in education—teachers. It is to these three groups that we now turn.

3. The Participants of Reform – Students, Parents, and Teachers

STUDENTS

The 60's saw the emergence of the three parties closest to the learning front—students, parents, and teachers. The 70's will doubtless see parents and teachers—the major teachers of the young—as well as students become the major influencers of educational direction. These three parties have risen to power through dissent—students through increased activism, parents through loss of confidence and school boycotts, teachers through militancy (e.g., strikes).

The elements of dissent in this country have provided the educator with an enormous resource for understanding the failures and possibilities of American schools. The consumers of the public service of education, students *and* parents, are moving in unprecedented numbers against the institutions that have rendered them powerless. The institutional and adult power base has been shaken by the volcanic force of the young. As recently as five years ago, an alienated youngster wondered what was wrong with *him* if he felt uncomfortable with his environment. Now he knows his disaffection is shared by his peers, and such awareness nurtures his protest.

The overwhelming student presence is neither an historical fluke nor the manipulated mechanism of one political faction. Parental, administrative, and governmental threats may diminish the overt expressions of the student movement, but they cannot annihilate the roots; bandaging an ugly sore may camouflage an infection, but it cannot provide a cure. And the student movement, like the bandaged sore that defies healing, is merely a symptom of a broader infection. The students of this era, unlike their ancestors, are not "getting over it," for the boundaries of their disaffection transcend temporary political and generational friction:

> [Stephen] Spender . . . understands the cultural roots of student alienation, that they are trying to change values and consciousness rather than lay down a program and seize state

power. He understands that they are trying to make revolutionaries, rather than make a revolution, that they are trying to make a parallel world.[1]

The school, as the immediate community of the young, is the most obvious target for reform. The Lemberg Center for the Study of Civil Disorders at Brandeis University reported that between January and April of 1968, 44 percent of the disturbances in six riot-prone cities involved schools—a threefold increase in one year. A report recently released by the National Association of Secondary School Principals on the nature and extent of student activism found that nearly three out of five principals reported some form of active protest in their schools—whether junior or senior high, whether urban, suburban, or rural.[2] The prevalent outrage against the sham of contemporary America is intensified toward the miniature society of the school, yet we manifest diseased distortions of each.

Today's young people comprise the first generation weaned by the mass media. The effects of watching the world in the living room are now becoming manifest. In a recent psychological study, selected small children clearly demonstrated one horrifying aspect of television's impact. When told of death or illness in the family, these children immediately asked if their relatives had been assassinated. The ever-present television screen exposes even a three-year-old to the brutalities, realities, and fantasies of the world. The adolescent easily perceives that thing which grown-ups call "the real world" as a chaotic phenomenon. Were it not for TV, today's youngster might consider his sense of isolation only a temporary function of adolescence.

> It's hard to remember sometimes that television is machinery—bits of equipment, consoles, cables, lenses, little hack boxes—and that when you turn it on one day (most days, in fact) and get *The Flying Nun*, you think of it as junk, as if the junk were somehow built into the equipment, and that when you turn it on another day and get, say, Dean Rusk and the gang down at the Foreign Relations Committee, or Bobby Kennedy announcing his reassessment, you think—well, what do you think! *The*

---

[1] Newfield, Jack. Review of *The Year of the Young Rebels* by Stephen Spender. *New York Times Book Review*, May 11, 1969. p. 5.

[2] Trump, J. Lloyd, and Hunt, Jane. "The Nature and Extent of Student Activism." *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 53: 150-58; May 1969.

> *Flying Nun* is interrupting Dean Rusk? Dean Rusk is interrupting *The Flying Nun*? This country seems to include both, in some mysterious, lunatic balance, and television has generally managed to push the balance so far out of whack that the country is barely recognizable to itself most of the time.[3]

In addition to parading America's paradoxes, the whole realm of technology desensitizes the student to the bland stimuli in the classroom. Today's youngster is bombarded by strobe light shows, electrical guitar shrieks; stimulation has been elevated immeasurably. The same music that delights and relaxes him appalls and unnerves his parents. The clinical and uninspired classroom cannot compel the attention of today's young Americans. The wonder is not so much that so many young people "tune out," but that they ever "tune in."

Contemporary students have acquired a certain level of sophistication through technological development. On the one hand, this worldliness expands the youngster's scope, but on the other hand, it accelerates anxiety. Today's student, aware of the game the world is playing, is faced with three alternatives. He can withdraw from the game entirely, play according to the rules until he finds a way to expose it from within, or challenge the game itself. The hippie movement demonstrates the enormous appeal of withdrawal. At its original, most sophisticated moments, hippiedom sought to construct a social and economic alternative to the normative middle-class game. Concluding that the values of Americana and happiness are mutually exclusive, the hippies adopted antithetical criteria in fringe communities. The three-piece suit gave way to a haphazard costume; the studied coiffure was replaced by masses of curls. The hippie founders were not the 14-year-old runaways of *Time-Life* fame, but very serious young people longing for the promises of 18th century America. The hippies' staggering popularity has served to confirm their suspicions. Love beads and long hair are not coincidental fashion trends; they are tacit expressions of sympathy toward the hippie movement.

If "dropping-out" were an East Village peculiarity, the social import of the hippies would be minimal. However, evidence of drug use is not confined to the commune. The *New York Times* recently disclosed that 85 percent of the Columbia University undergraduate population has smoked marijuana at least once. Marijuana is no longer the Novocaine of the poor but a fashionable, generally accepted pastime of the American middle class. Though heroin is still predominantly confined to impoverished neighborhoods, LSD is considered an elite intellectual adventure. The whole vocabulary attached to narcotics is based on the notion of mental seclusion: Timothy Leary's slogan, "tune in, turn on, drop out"; "tripping out" on LSD; getting "high," "stoned," "wrecked," "destroyed" on marijuana. The concept built into this extravagant use of drugs is the erasure of the "artificial" and complex considerations of society and the substitution of the "real" world of the human mind. Bob Dylan's allegory has touched and attracted a generation of sympathizers:

---

[3] Arlen, J. Michael. *The Living Room War: Writings About Television.* New York: Atheneum, 1969. p. 190.

> Take me disappearing through the smoke rings of my mind
> Down the foggy ruins of time
> Far past the frozen leaves
> The haunted frightened trees
> Out to the windy beach
> Far from the twisted reach of crazy sorrow.
> Yes, to dance beneath the diamond sky
> With one hand waving free
> Silhouetted by the sea
> Circled by the circus sands
> With all memory and fate
> Driven deep within the waves
> Let me forget about today until tomorrow.

The great majority of young people neither drop out nor challenge the system, but simply ride along with the institutional tides. This route, of course, is the safest and most accepted; dropouts and rebels invite censure. Part of this group is no doubt unaware that there is a game at all, but many fulfill society's expectations cynically. They intend to stand inconspicuously in the crowd until they are close enough to the emperor to expose his foolishness. These youngsters become Peace Corps volunteers, the politely persistent junior senators, the adamant young members of the Legal Aid Society. Their compliance with the system is often misinterpreted as proof that the system is viable. The young people who play the game do not disprove the existence of the game itself.

The public challengers of the schools not only represent an outspoken minority, but articulate the feelings of many less tenacious, yet similarly disaffected, young people. The so-called student movement does not present a unified program, for as Spender so perceptively indicated, the root of the uprising is beyond the realm of politics. All students are responding to their visions of themselves as victims—victims of an institution and a society at large that have repeatedly and undeniably refused to recognize them. Even the most disparate splinter groups are expressing common, and essentially emotional, grievances. All students, regardless of specific affiliations, want to be *seen;* they want to be acknowledged as thinking, feeling human beings. Secondly, they want to participate in the process of their education. How very obvious it seems: "Look, if this school is supposed to be for *me,* then let me tell you how I feel about it." Finally, students want their curriculum to be applicable to their individual lives—culturally, politically, socially, and personally. The cry for "relevance" is also painfully self-evident; who wants to study something he can't "relate" to? All three of these demands, though they have political translations like "democracy" and "freedom," stem from the most fundamental human needs, needs the school has persisted in ignoring.

Because the student has been an anonymous face for so long, his desire to assert himself is now exaggerated. If one has been declared impotent, his exuberance in affirming his own power can lead him to point a machine gun at the dean, or destroy a private file, or paralyze the operation of an institution. The idea of recognition does not seem preposterous within the existing school system, yet consider the realities. The high school functions on a principle of adjustment: you will adjust, or you will suffer the consequences. The student is recognized *only* when he deviates from the norm, either negatively or positively. He is summoned to the principal's office if he cuts a class, talks back to a teacher, is found in the hall without a pass. His chances of being summoned are slightly less if he excels academically, supports the policies of the school, or breaks up a fight in the gym. The undistinguished C student, however, graduates without ever having crossed the threshold of the principal's office.

The student is punished or rewarded according to his ability to adjust. If he cannot tell the difference between a predicate nominative and a predicate adjective, it is *his* fault—not the teacher's, or the book's, or the school's. Therefore, the D on the report card absolves the institution of responsibility, and the child is left to his own devices. The existing school, therefore, recognizes only its idea of what a student ought to be. He ought to be obedient, competent, and efficient, for these are the most expedient criteria for adult society. In perpetuating this notion of adaptation, the school denies itself the theoretical justification for an educational institution, the development of human potential. The existing school provides no mechanism for adjusting to the needs of the child, and, insofar as the school aims at preserving a smooth, unruffled operation, the student has to be a secondary consideration.

The concept of recognition—on an extremely personal level—is a theme for much of the student movement. Revolting against the societal tradition of judging an individual according to his extrinsic qualities, today's youngsters are interested only in intrinsic worth. They scorn definitions of people that deal with wealth, status, grade level, size of house, or number of television sets. Their language, like much of their behavior, is the language of confrontation. They admire those who talk "straight," those who seem to be authentic; credentials convince them of nothing. The student's value system has ousted society's normative psychology in favor of the individual's energy and growth; they are as interested in "becoming" as they are in "being," and they seek environments that allow for individual development. An environment that maximizes a student's potential could never "fail" anyone.

The students' plea for participation in the classroom and the school community is not operational in the existing institution. Educational decision making is the business of the professional; he draws on his own experience, available information, and state requirements to design his school's academic and social framework. The professional, himself, is limited by restrictions that he cannot control; he is subject to a board of education, the judgment of his peer group, and the state government. It has been proposed in the U.S. Congress that the federal government deny financial subsidy to any school that tolerates student disturbances. The educational administrator is frequently powerless himself, but he participates in the professional hierarchy that deprives the student of an active voice in planning curriculum and establishing social rules in the school community. The student's voice is not only inaudible but extraneous in the existing institution. The student is a mute subject in the kingdom of the professional and he knows it.

Along with the student's subjection to social anachronisms, he is also plagued by a stale curriculum. He is the recipient of a worn-out "line," a line that contradicts all his social experience.

Built into contemporary curriculums are the concepts of individuality ("How come I can't be me in school?"), virtue ("If I always told the truth, I'd always be in detention"), American infallibility ("Why do Europeans hate the war in Vietnam?"), equal opportunity ("How come the maid is black?"), ad infinitum. Though he may acquire some general and ultimately helpful information in the process, the American public school student is fed a banquet of absolutes from a cafeteria of uncertainties. Apart from the jolting discrepancy between the platitudes of the textbook and the realities of the world, the teacher rarely allows the world into the classroom. Little course content deals honestly (if at all) with the local community surrounding the school or with the community at large. The student may acquire the primitive tools of language, science, and mathematics, but he acquires no techniques for social action. He is not only deprived of a realistic view of the status quo, but he is ignorant of the available or potential mechanisms for change. The traditional underpinnings of American education do not provide those learning experiences that prepare people to be productive members of society.

The students' demands of their schools are as pragmatic as the American dream. They want to be prepared as future workers, with multiple options for professional achievement. (It is interesting to note that vocational schools report fewer incidents of student unrest than their academic counterparts.) They want to be provided with tools for reconstructing the society that requires change. They want to be familiarized with the intricate workings of their society, a familiarity that requires *more* than the cherry tree saga or memorizing the Bill of Rights; they would also like to know about themselves as social creatures, to achieve a modicum of self-awareness through the interaction of the classroom. In short, today's students want a school in which they can learn.

Recently, certain students have raised the quite fundamental question of whether a student is actually a citizen, protected by the Constitution of the United States. Those concerned with student rights, such as Ira Glasser, have argued convincingly for a Bill of Rights for Students.[4] Glasser and his associates have ample evidence to indicate that students daily are denied such constitutionally guaranteed rights as due process and free speech. New

---

[4] Glasser, Ira. "Schools for Scandal: The Bill of Rights and Public Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 51: 190-94; December 1969.

York City and Philadelphia Public Schools have adopted policies on a Student Bill of Rights.

Students' rights are also being emphasized by such programs as former Commissioner of Education James Allen's Right-to-Read program. Moreover, child psychiatrists, such as Albert Solnit at the Yale Child Study Center, are beginning to point to other rights (especially for the younger student)—"the right to fantasy, the right to play," etc.

In the decades ahead, we will undoubtedly see the law involved more fully in the entire question of student (and parent) rights.

PARENTS

The emergence of the parent and community as a legitimate public in urban school affairs had its symbolic beginning in the fall of 1966, with the events surrounding I.S. 201 (Intermediate School 201) in East Harlem. At that time a group of parents and community residents protested the opening of a new, windowless, model school, which was supposed to be integrated and was not. The I.S. 201 incident occurred at a time when both integration and compensatory education were being viewed with increasing skepticism by those who depended on them most. The protest of parents and community ushered in a new alternative—reform through parent and community participation.

Parents are also teachers. Their school is the home. If parents and teachers, home and school, are not connected in a genuine partnership, then the consequences for child growth and development can be severe. There is a functional relationship between the environment generated by the parents and the community and the child's attitude toward school. If parents and other community residents view the school as an ineffective, unresponsive institution, the child could very easily enter school in a mood of distrust, anxiety, or hostility. On the other hand, if parents and community perceive the school as a place with which they are closely associated, with which they can identify, which is accountable for educational quality, which is their own, then the chances of children entering the school with positive feelings and expectations are greatly enhanced.

The importance of positive expectations to success in learning was emphasized by the data of the Coleman study on the effects of school on achievement:

> Attitudes such as a sense of control of the environment, or belief in the responsiveness of the environment, are extremely highly related to achievement, [more so than other school-related factors such as school plant and curriculum].
>
> Minority pupils . . . have far less conviction than whites that they can affect their own environment and futures. When they do, however, their achievement is higher than that of whites who lack that conviction.[5]

An effective school system, therefore, must be so organized as to give full play to the role of the parent and community.

Today, parents are organizing into associations and unions in order to maximize their voice in school matters. The call for decentralization and community control has been triggered largely by the parent and community movement.

TEACHERS

Teachers have also organized politically in order to pursue their perceived needs more systematically. They have had to deal with an unresponsive institution in which they were low men on the totem pole in power terms. They have become a collective body with strength in numbers and improved competence. They can now make demands, using the very real threat of the ultimate power play, i.e., bring the institution to an abrupt halt through a strike. Teachers have moved into the political realm out of necessity. Poorly paid, often abused by the constraints of a top-down bureaucratic structure, too frequently perceived as docile do-gooders who do a routine job, teachers have begun to demonstrate their potency through basic issues that improve their status—salaries and working conditions.

Having entered the power domain—the politics of education—teachers look to their professional organizations to protect their long-awaited gains. Faced with "threats" from various sources—historically from school management (administrators), more recently from parents and students—teachers have turned all the more to their professional organizations.

Some teacher organizations are on a collision course with the consumer. Others have already collided. Some teacher groups have resisted the demands of the consumer because these demands were a threat to teacher interests. But teachers and other professionals are beginning to realize that their own interests and those of education are best served by an alliance with the consumer. They now recognize that the standard urban school as an educational institution is outmoded for them as well as for those being served. Certainly teachers realize that what many parents and students are protesting is the poor quality of education they are receiving at a time when education is crucial to their very survival in an advanced technological society.

---

[5] Coleman, James S., and others. *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966. p. 325. Summary Report, p. 22.

Frustrated, the consumer protests in various ways—lack of confidence in schools and those who run them, defeat of bond issues, student dropouts (pushouts), activism, boycotts, sit-ins, etc. These protests are aimed at reversing the spirit of decline in the quality of schooling. Those teachers and professionals who automatically assume a position of protecting or defending the existing educational patterns are viewed by the urban consumer as part of the basic problem. The response by the consumer to those who defend a failing situation is to consider him "the enemy."

Educators must demonstrate to the public much more dramatically that their basic interests as professionals are really aligned with the interests of children, not with the preservation of their own interests or those of a sinking educational institution. This will not be an easy task. Teachers are now seeing their professional organizations not merely as protective agencies but as active forces in the advancement of educational ideals. Professional leadership that stresses this crucial community of interest of teachers and the public is making the highest contribution to the entire educational field.

At the same time, the continuing push toward power politics makes it somewhat difficult to talk about "partnership," particularly partnership between teachers and parents or teachers and students. Rather, with the rise of other "power groups" (students and parents), the tendency in at least some of our urban systems is toward "coalitions" or negotiated understanding between and among these basic power publics.

While we are on the subject of power politics as a big-city school reality, it is worth noting that students are organizing into political blocks such as student unions, and so are parents, e.g., the Union of Concerned Parents in New York City. We seem to be moving toward a "balance of powers" as a transitional *modus operandi;* the agents closest to the action are connecting from a base of organized power. Consequently, there emerge negotiations that deal with "accountability of teachers," "rights of teachers," "rights of students." This "we-they" relationship hopefully will soften, as will the hard lines separating some of these "natural allies," and move toward a stage of mutual cooperation around the common concern for urban school reform.

4. Utilizing the Participants as Reform Energy

THE DEMANDS OF MODERN SOCIETY

In a democratic society, when a major social institution such as the public school is in need of reform, the public has an obligation to participate in the process. The essence of an open society rests with this process of participation. Hitler may have employed a different process to reform the schools, but such a process would be totally unacceptable to us, regardless of its efficiency.

Making democracy work is never easy, and as we listen to the voices of dissent we can hear quite clearly the call for increased participation. Can we harness the constructive energies of the parties of interest toward the common problem of school reform? Can we really practice participatory democracy? Or shall we enter the realm of confrontation politics, of open conflict between and among the major publics of our urban schools? The choice is clearly ours.

Young people are demanding that schools be relevant to their lives. Parents in minority groups are asking for schools that can guarantee equality of educational performance. Business and industry require the educational preparation necessary for a service-oriented economy. The makers of national policy look to the schools for the manpower needs of an advanced technological society. In the post-Sputnik era of the late 1950's, schools were asked to produce more scientists. Earlier in the century, vocational programs were created to supply changing labor needs. In recent decades, we have asked schools to grapple with our monumental social problems: poverty, alienation, delinquency, and racism. Schools have become central to our national defense and to the frenetic growth of the great society. We have asked schools to educate everyone and, simultaneously, to develop the maximum potential of the individual child.

In short, while we have imposed qualitative demands at a geometric rate, we have only provided our schools with the means to respond at a simple *arithmetic* rate. Consequently, American educational institutions are incapable of fulfilling a series of complicated, though certainly legitimate, missions. We are expecting an educational system rooted in the 19th century to solve 20th and 21st century problems. The results of this irreconcilable discrepancy include loss of confidence; disconnectedness; alienation; the inevitable retaliation of students, parents, business, and industry; and increased concern among government officials.

It is inaccurate and deluding to attribute this discrepancy to any one group, whether it be administrators, supervisors, teachers, students, parents, or communities. The root of the problem rests in the institution itself—in the form and shape of the system in which all these factions must function, in the institutional atmosphere and its effects on the parties of interest. *The problem, therefore, is with the existing system, not the individuals whom it controls, shapes, and determines.* It is unfortunate that these parties, who are involved in a common struggle, have been diverted by conflict among themselves. Their superfluous disagreements squander their energy—energy that could be mobilized to generate the necessary power for institutional renovation.

Modern education is strategically tied to the needs of society, of groups, and of individuals, and the encompassing growth and development of all of these. An obsolete educational institution handicaps *all* learners, teachers, administrators, communities, and the larger societies; thus, we are all disadvantaged. The underlying assumptions of the present educational system derive from outdated notions of man and his environment, based on a "Newtonian" model of human nature. The 20th century, however, has experienced drastic changes in the concept of man, influenced powerfully by Einstein's more adaptable, flexible framework. Ira Gordon delineates these differences:

Newtonian Model Man	*Einsteinian Model Man*
A mechanistic, fixed, closed system characterized by—	**An open-energy, self-organizing system characterized by—**
1. Fixed intelligence	**1. Modifiable intelligence**
2. Development as orderly unfolding	**2. Development as modifiable in both rate and sequence**
3. Potential as fixed, although indeterminable	**3. Potential as created through transaction and environment**
4. A telephone-switchboard brain	**4. A computer brain**

Newtonian Model Man	*Einsteinian Model Man*
5. Steam-engine driven motor	5. A nuclear power-plant energy system
6. Homeostatic regulator (drive reduction)	6. Initial guidance and self-feedback motivation system
7. Inactive until engine is stoked	7. Continuously active[1]

We are expecting the schools to accomplish a mission for which they are virtually unequipped. For professionals trying to respond to the challenge, the results have been enormously frustrating. Schoolmen have felt isolated, misunderstood, and often betrayed. In their efforts to fulfill the task, educators have had to deal with the reality of available resources and with the constraints of existing organizations. To compound these factors, those farthest from the learner have been making decisions about his nature and needs; hierarchy and bureaucracy have severely limited the development of pedagogical procedures. The established institutional operations are not only paralyzing for the learner but for the practitioner as well.

DIVERSITY

As urban America becomes a way of life, the tremendous diversity of the population presents another element for educational consideration. To some city dwellers, diversity seems an exciting possibility for the enrichment and expansion of one's own perceptions and experiences; these individuals are nourished by variety. More often, however, diversity is perceived as a threat. Typically, the city contains distinct ethnic and racial ghettos.

The urban school has traditionally considered itself the great homogenizer. It has embraced hordes of diverse populations and absorbed them into the mainstream of middle-class life. For centuries, this method of assimilation has melted the Irish, the Poles, the Jews into life in the United States rather painlessly. The 1960's, however, saw a philosophical revolution among "the unmeltable blacks," and ethnic awareness has become a popular theme among the young—both black and white.

We are just beginning to acknowledge that racism exists among highly educated groups and their institutions. For years many of our automatic responses have been colonial or racist in their implication and ultimately harmful to the growth and development of all children. In 1937, the Standard American Encyclopedia published this statement in its first volume: "*Apaches:* They were long the scourge of the frontiers and resisted obstinately every attempt to civilize them." This statement is still found in the latest edition, which appeared in 1958.

---

[1] Fantini, Mario, and Weinstein, Gerald. *The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education.* New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

The case of America's blacks is equally devastating:

> As for Sambo, whose wrongs moved the abolitionists to wrath and tears, there is some reason to believe that he suffered less than any other class in the South from its "peculiar institution" [slavery]. Although brought to America by force, the incurably optimistic negro [sic] soon became attached to the country and devoted to his white folks.
>
> The Afro-American in traditional American history books is really two people: one is "Sambo," a scaled-down creature on a distorted page (the authors of the above paragraph obviously never knew any); the other is "Zero" an invisible man on a missing page.[2]

It is idle, and even dangerous, to rationalize either riots or ultramilitant black power separatism as the expressions of a small segment of the Negro population. These manifestations are the tip of a pyramid and should serve as a warning that violence, frustration, and doubt are prevalent in the broad base below.

The new sense of worth has found expression in a rich variety of activity—ranging from the adoption of African dress in some Negro circles to the formation of black student groups on Ivy League campuses. But the core was expressed simply by a small group of black demonstrators at the 1968 Republican Convention. A thirteen-year-old Mississippi boy led them in a chant:

"I may be black," he shouted.
"But I am somebody," the demonstrators responded.
"I may be poor."
"But I am somebody."
"I may be hungry."
"But I am somebody."

---

[2] Lindenmeyer, Otto. *Black History: Lost, Stolen or Strayed.* New York: Avon Books. p. 15.

As racial pride has begun to grow, fetters of self-hatred and imposed inferiority have loosened and will undoubtedly continue to do so. A popular rock song, "Message to a Black Man," sung by the Temptations, has this refrain: "No matter how hard you try, you can't stop me now."

The existing school is overwhelmingly unprepared to allow for diversity. Where, after all, does the standard curriculum come from? Perhaps a few teachers and a supervisor of a particular subject area form a committee to determine a valuable course of study for everyone. This handful of individuals, chosen from thousands in a large school system, represents four or five schools out of hundreds. They meet regularly to determine the seventh or eighth grade social studies "course of study," which has been renamed "curriculum guide" to imply a more progressive approach. These people, after sessions of discussion, propose activities for each and every classroom in the city, at that grade level. The proposed material is laid out in standardized form, with objectives, content outlines, activities, resources. There is also a "suggested" time allotment for each division. The central administration delivers final approval, and the package goes to press. Each teacher in the appropriate grade receives what is customarily a handsomely designed document, and this becomes the official curriculum for that year.

Contrary to all we have learned about human behavior, individual differences, and various abilities, learning styles, and interests, this package is an official proclamation that every child in the same grade will learn the same thing at once and in the same time span. Of course, the administrative policy and ultimate classroom activities are rarely identical. Nevertheless, there is sufficient pressure generated by the document to make teachers feel anxious about how much of the material they are "covering." Who has not heard the familiar sound of "I simply must get to 1890 before the end of the term!" And 1890, much less 1960, is frequently left unfinished. Think of our own school experiences: Pilgrims, Pilgrims, Pilgrims, Pilgrims, Colonists, and with luck, the American Revolution. Few teachers ever went further than the Civil War during an entire year. World War I, the Depression, World War II, and the post-war era were book sections that we flipped through on our own—sometimes during *another* class period devoted to Colonial America.

Even though the curriculum prescriptions were rarely filled, teacher-anxiety persisted. In our own experimental schools, when teachers were given greater freedom and flexibility regarding curriculum, there seemed to be a leftover anxiety about deviating too far from the official document.

It is inconsistent to ask more and more urban teachers to read, study, and try to understand their pupils as much as possible; to attempt to perceive a child's frame of reference, interests, and the effects of his hidden curriculum; and at the same time, to limit a teacher's freedom to put such knowledge to use by boxing him in with curricular mandates. What we end up with is a curriculum geared to uniformity rather than to diversity.

In the existing educational institution, there is *one* way of doing things: students are expected to be quiet and orderly in the classroom; they adhere to the rules of standardized American English; they all take the same tests; they must be respectful and obedient. What if you were raised in a home where laughter, messiness, and slang are the rules? Are you *wrong* to want to laugh if something is funny? The existing school contains very clear concepts of right and wrong and, consequently, there can be no room for differences. In a pluralistic society, diversity *is* a value and must be expressed in our educational institutions.

5. Governance, Substance, and Personnel

Fundamental reform leading to a modernized and more relevant educational institution cannot occur unless three major pillars of the present educational system are changed:

> *Governance*—the realignment of the parties involved in the process of educational decision making. A shift toward giving parents, teachers, community residents, and students an increased voice in policy. A change in the politics of education.
>
> *Substance*—the objectives to be achieved and the content to be learned. The search for relevance leading toward a more humanistically oriented curriculum dealing with individual and group problems; a more functional emphasis on identity, disconnection, and powerlessness in preparation for the major societal roles of worker, citizen, parent.
>
> *Personnel*—the people who will be responsible for implementation. Opening the educational system to a far broader base of talent than the conventionally prepared career educator; training through the reality of community needs and expressions.

These three pillars are being modified in several community-oriented experiments in New York, Washington, D.C., and Boston. In these experiments in broadened participation, the first modification has been with the governance pattern, which in turn has triggered change in the others. The direction of change appears to be as follows:

	TRADITIONAL	*REFORMED*
Center of Control	Professional dominance	The public, the community as partners with the professional
Role of Parent Organizations	To interpret the school to the community, for public relations	To participate as active agents in matters substantive to the educational process

	TRADITIONAL	*REFORMED*
Bureaucracy	Centralized authority, limiting flexibility and initiative to the professional at the individual school level	Decentralized decision making allowing for maximum local, lay, and professional initiative and flexibility, with central authority concentrating on technical assistance, long-range planning, and systemwide coordination
Educational Objectives	Emphasis on grade level performance, basic skills, cognitive (intellectual) achievement	Emphasis on both *cognitive* and *affective* (feeling) development. Humanistically oriented objectives—e.g., identity, connectedness, powerlessness
Curriculum Relevance	Determined by needs of the disciplines (physical sciences, social sciences)	Determined by needs of society, groups, the individual
Test of Professional Efficiency and Promotion	Emphasis on credentials and systematized advancement through the system	Emphasis on performance with students and with parent-community participants
Institutional Philosophy	Negative self-fulfilling prophecy; student failure blamed on learner and his background	Positive self-fulfilling prophecy; no student failures, only program failures; accountable to learner and community
Basic Learning Unit	Classroom, credentialized teacher, school building	The community, various agents as teachers, including other students and paraprofessionals[1]

We have indicated that institutional reform is the key to improved education for all. Relevance will be achieved when the reformed institution actually serves the needs of its clients.

Let us now examine the program implications in the three major sectors of the institution.

---

[1] Taken from the book *Community Involvement and School Reform* by Mario D. Fantini, to be published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston in 1971.

GOVERNANCE

Programs that increase the voice of the consumers in educational decision making are strategic in institutional reform. The input from clients adds important dimensions to the search for quality and relevance. For example, when students are involved in policy formation, they are quite likely to emphasize content that deals with the natural concerns of youth. "What does the curriculum have to do with me?" is a consensus question raised by students. They are seeking a functional link between school content and their intrinsic concerns: Who am I? Where am I going?

Parental involvement also carries important inputs. Parents want their children to succeed, to develop their individual talents, to proceed at their own rates, to be treated with respect, to have increased options as graduates. They are sensitive to powerful people in the institution and their attitudes toward the children. This is an important perspective for a better institution.

Community residents would contribute other goals. The school should deal with the concerns of members of the community, not just with those of children. This could lead to a community-school type of program. Residents could emphasize the need for the school to develop programs that are congruent with the cultural style of the community. Black studies, bilingual education, and community resources would all be advanced.

In short, the involvement of the consumer in educational policy will lead to a legitimization of new objectives together with the ground rules for achieving them.

When students, parents, and citizens have representation in the affairs of their institutions, they are themselves affected. We are all familiar with the processes of identification. People learn through identification. Seeing their own in positions of personal responsibility may influence the basic personal mechanism of instruction. The "fate control" variable that researchers point to more and more as instrumental to instruction and achievement may be realized, in part, through both client participation and identification.

Policies increasing participation at all levels of the institution will be emphasized by the governing bodies. Parent, student, and teacher councils will be organized in schools. Fuller use of paraprofessionals will be programed. In essence, new governance patterns that involve students, parents, and teachers in making decisions about schools provide the continuing energy for solving the problems of urban education through school reform.

It must be re-emphasized, however, that the problem of urban education rests mainly with the outmoded nature of today's schools as social institutions. If those who seek control do not use their new political energy toward reform, then the problems will continue regardless of who is in control. The mere transfer of power does not guarantee school reform. However, those seeking a greater voice in school policy are running on a platform of reform. They themselves have rendered the verdict that the present system is not working, and the hope is that they will exercise their new responsibilities to search out fresh options as alternatives.

SUBSTANCE

Most of us have focused our attention and proposals for reform on the material to be learned. When the issue of *relevance* is considered, it is usually limited to this context. Educational objectives, curriculum, methodology, and school organization are all ingredients of this concern. As such, the substance of education continues to be the most crucial, visible component of the institution.

From the expressions of students, parents, community groups, and professionals concerned with reform, we can anticipate the emergence of at least four sets of educational objectives.[2] These will likely be legitimized by the new governance patterns discussed earlier.

Basic Skills and Academic Mastery

The first set of objectives consists of the traditional ones geared to the attainment of academic skills and subject matter mastery. These are the objectives that presently dominate standard educational institutions. The present operational definition of quality education is tied to these objectives—grade level achievement in basic skills and academic subject areas as measured by standardized tests. This set of objectives has a strong *cognitive* (knowing) flavor and deals with such areas as the following:

---

[2] Fantini, Mario, and Weinstein, Gerald. *Making Urban Schools Work.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

1. Learning-to-learn skills (attending, evaluation, etc.).
2. Symbolic-technical proficiency (reading, arithmetic, and so forth).
3. Information from selected disciplines (commonly history and geography).
4. Structure of knowledge (concepts from disciplines).
5. Modes of inquiry (how scholars think).
6. Broad philosophical schools or problems (esthetics, ethics).

The programs and processes used to attain these objectives are becoming individually designed; strong emphasis is being given to self-instructional techniques such as Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI). The computer as a diagnostic instrument is moving slowly into this arena. Educational television also will take on more of the professional flavor now reserved for commercial television, as seen in *Sesame Street.*

A strong tutorial component can have a productive effect in this realm. In addition to paraprofessionals, students themselves (at all levels, from elementary through college) represent an important tutorial service. Tutorial training efforts such as programed tutors developed by Professor Elson at the University of Indiana and the tutorial effort at the Pacoima School at Los Angeles are examples of this effort.

Teachers whose styles are best suited to the achievement of these objectives will be used. As we shall see later, those teachers whose styles are geared to other objectives will be similarly matched.

Talents and Careers

A second set of educational objectives focuses upon individual talents, interests, and the innate ability of the learners. The curricular mode associated with those objectives is also highly individualized, but has a different tone. Whereas the first set of objectives was fed to the child, the second set draws from him in the form of whatever latent talents or abilities potentially exist. This program would open up everything from learning to play the tuba to constructing a violin, working on a research project of one's own design, producing a movie or a TV program, studying Swahili (if not included in the first set of objectives), or writing a play.

Those processes usually associated with vocational education would also be linked to these objectives. As Marvin Feldman, formerly of the Ford Foundation, explained:

> No effort should be spared to develop appreciation and respect for the varying talents of the individual on the part of the pupil as well as of the school system. A major objective of elementary school education should be to seek out the talent in each and show its relationship to the world of work. . . . [The school should] attempt to acquaint the student with the workings of industry and commerce, and help him match his talents to his career objectives. It [also should] include an annual career-objective analysis for each student as diagnosed, discussed, predicted, and evaluated by the combined resources of man-made examinations, computer-oriented methodologies, and man and machine-derived interpretations.[3]

Comprehensive career education models that provide better educational programs for more students of diverse abilities represent one type of program. Such a model would not flounder under the stigma of "manual training," but would include four distinct aims: (a) to identify the talent and learning style of the individual, (b) to give him both physical and social knowledge of the world in which he lives, (c) to develop the skills he needs to sustain and advance his life so that he may be a productive and creative individual in society, and (d) to satisfy the individual's search for his own life values. In a comprehensive career model, the means for reaching these options, however, would be different from the means of most public schools; they would put greater stress upon experientially oriented learning processes.

This design would begin in the elementary school with identification of the individual's talent and personality and acquisition of general knowledge through various learning styles. Career guidance would be introduced in the middle school years and would acquaint each student with the workings of industry and commerce to help match his talents with his career objectives ("Who am I going to be?" "What am I going to do?"). The high school would be redesigned as a multihouse establishment, organized around learning style laboratories, each of which would have an interdisciplinary teaching team in the corresponding teaching style. A new institution of higher learning would complete the framework. Its charge would be to accept students with manipulative, social, athletic, esthetic, mechanical, graphic, artistic, or perceptive aptitudes (not only those who possess verbal aptitude) and help them to establish some degree of vocational unity and organization from the vast array of knowledge that continually confronts them.

---

[3] Feldman, Marvin J. *Making Education Relevant.* New York: Ford Foundation, 1966.

Social Action

A third set of objectives deals squarely with the issues and problems of social action personally related to the learner. This set of objectives deals with the political socialization—the citizenship—of the student. Examples of these objectives might be the following:

1. To have the learner acquire the skills of negotiating with adults.
2. To have the learner devise a variety of strategies for getting something he wants.
3. To have the learner discover how to identify the real power sources in his community.
4. To have the learner develop the skills of organizing people in order to create change in his immediate school situation.
5. To have the learner use all forms of media in order to gain support for some social action that he intends to take.
6. To have the learner develop general skills for constructive social action.

In order to develop skills in social action, the learners must be given opportunities in real life situations. Roles are learned from participation in reality contexts. This means that students would be working with poverty agencies, early childhood units, governmental institutions, hospitals, old age homes, etc. By relating to these clinical environments, students would acquire both the language and the behaviors necessary to deal with current social problems. The school would help the student conceptualize social realities and assist him in the process of developing alternative approaches to improving the environment of all people.

Identity, Power, and Connectedness

The issues of identity, power, and connectedness, while pervading all spheres of the curriculum, become the fourth set of legitimate objectives. These objectives come to grips with the learner's concerns: Who am I? Who are we? What does the school have to do with me? The skills developed in this realm deal with self-awareness and help learners to recognize and release the flow of inner feelings as they encourage openness, authenticity, and sensitivity to self and others. Curriculum techniques developed in such centers as Bethel and Esalen would be tapped. These might include emotional expression, encounter groups, sensory training, Gestalt therapy, improvisational theater, and the like.

It is important to note that the four sets of educational objectives are not limited to children. In fact, for schools to become relevant they will increasingly need to serve adults and not just children. As the school becomes a community school—open evenings, weekends, and summers—the curriculum for adults and children will become synthesized around these common objectives.

To develop processes that are functionally linked to these four sets of educational objectives requires basic shifts in curriculum. For example, the objectives point to an expanded view of the learning environment in which the classroom becomes the community. Some of these shifts can be summarized as follows:

From	*To*
uniform	diversified
symbolistic	experiential
remote	immediate
what	why
academic	participatory
antiseptic	reality-oriented
cognitive-extrinsic content	cognitive-intrinsic-affective content
intellectual-abstract	humanistic-personal

The shift in curriculum reflects a basic shift in the relationship between cognition and affect. In the traditional institution, affect was viewed only in terms of motivation, as the means for connecting the learner with the institutional content—academic knowledge as determined by the need of the discipline. The reformed institution reverses the flow by linking knowledge to the learner's intrinsic concerns.

It is important to note here that a curriculum can be "relevant" and still include poetry, the fine arts, and philosophy or history. Often when the humanities appear to be irrelevant, it is because of inadequate presentation. The themes of adolescence—isolation, alienation, sensitivity in an insane world—these major threads of the art unfortunately become camouflaged by "the color of her dress in Chapter 2" and similar overconcentration on detail.

PERSONNEL

The educational objectives and concomitant curriculum will necessitate a different view of the people who man the institution. Rather than view every teacher as an all-purpose person, equipped to do whatever is needed, we might want to consider matching teachers to particular objectives. As mentioned earlier, certain teachers are better suited, more stylistically attuned, to a particular set of objectives. For example, there are those who are technically oriented and strong in basic skill development, while others may be disposed toward cultivating interpersonal behavior and attitudes. Matching teachers and tasks could have a salutory effect on both the learner and the teacher.

Matching teachers to objectives is only one linkage. Matching teacher style to learner style is still another. Some learners seem to respond to inductive, unstructured environments; some others to deductive, structured settings. Some learners are manipulative; others are conceptual. For too many learners, the school is dull and two-dimensional. But the real world is fast and three- and four-dimensional. To help "turn on" learners, specialists in such areas as plastics, electronics, crafts, media, and theater will work in schools and become an integral part of the staff. These specialists with modern skills can help make learning concrete and exciting. The various learning dispositions lend themselves to different teacher styles. It is clear that enhancing the learning potential of students requires, among other changes, a fundamental difference in staff utilization from that which presently prevails.

To achieve greater relevance, the staff must consider the following matches:

1. The *how* of teaching (procedure) with the learner's style *of* learning.
2. The *what* of teaching (content) with the learner's knowledge of his physical realm of experience *(the learner's reality)*.
3. The *who* of teaching (personality, ethnicity, race) with different students. For some minority-group students (black, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Indian) a teacher from their own group may be needed. With racism surrounding us, more serious consideration of such matches is necessary.
4. The *how, what, who* of teaching with the learner's *feelings* about his experiences. For instance, an urban reading series of a unit on city policemen may be used because the learner "knows" them. But if the learner has a fear of policemen by

virtue of his particular experience with them and if his feelings are disregarded, this content can inhibit learning.

5. The *how, what, who* of teaching with the *concerns* of the learner. Concerns also involve feelings and emotions, but at a much deeper level. Concerns are the persistent, pervasive threads of an underlying uneasiness the learners have about themselves and their relation to the world. These concerns might center on questions of *identity, powerlessness,* and *disconnection.*

The changing institution will also necessitate a shift in conception of staff development. Since present training agencies are themselves tied to outdated educational processes, they have a limited impact on professional behavior. Most behavior is shaped on the job and by the nature of the institutions. Outdated institutions produce outdated behavior. Consequently, as institutions are changed, so will be the behavior of those in them.

In summary then, a viable school must satisfy the following criteria:

1. Social reality and the school's curriculum have to be intrinsically connected.
   a. The school must acknowledge the realities by setting up a structure in which students are engaged in the examination of these realities.
   b. Students will learn the skills and behaviors needed to influence social realities.
   c. The skills and behaviors for social change will be applied by the students to the social realities.
2. Power, identity, and connectedness have to become a legitimized basis for curriculum development with the aim of expanding the repertoire of responses students have to deal with these concerns.
3. Diversity, both cultural and individual, and its potential for cross-fertilization has to be encouraged and expanded through educational objectives and organization that allow and legitimize such an aim.
4. The school and the community it serves have to exist less as separate entities and instead develop responsibilities and lines of authority that are more integrated and shared.[4]

---

[4] Fantini, Mario, and Weinstein, Gerald. *Making Urban Schools Work.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968. pp. 24-25.

The realities of governance, substance, and personnel in the existing school cannot help but thwart the learner and those closest to him. The next chapter will deal with the major process of achieving institutional reform in our society—participation.

It is one thing to talk about institutional reform as a desired *end* and it is quite another thing to suggest the *means* for getting there. In the pages that follow an attempt will be made to plot one possible transitional process, using the general vehicle of participation.

The second transitional phase is more specific and is intended to suggest a way of moving from a traditional school environment, which is at best compensatory in nature (rehabilitating the child to fit the standard school), to a school that begins to adapt itself to students. By using the experience of an inner-city experimental project—the Madison Area Project, Syracuse, N.Y.—the shifts in such thinking and program development become more understandable.

Also, we shall propose a specific organizational vehicle, one that centers on the role of the teacher as instructional decision maker. For it is the constructive energy of the teachers that must be tapped if real reform is to come about.

Finally, we shall propose an expanded notion of public education, one that maximizes the choice for all the parties of interest.

6. Public Participation–Criticism and Justification

When social institutions such as the school grow obsolete—when they fail to serve the needs of people—then, in our society, it is the responsibility of the public to update them. The public can accomplish this in a number of ways: by direct participation in the reform, by delegating this responsibility to the professional, or by doing it jointly.

Participation by the consumers of urban public schools—students, parents, community residents—represents the emergence of important publics that separately or together wield an enormous amount of energy. These new energy sources can either combine with the professionals to bring about fundamental reform of our urban schools, or they can level their energies against the officials of city schools. In the latter course, collision seems almost inevitable if basic changes are not made in urban schooling. Ironically, basic changes are not likely without public community support. Parent and community protests; student unrest in urban, suburban, and rural schools; low achievement; and dropouts are all symptoms of basic ailments of public schools as social institutions.

Criticism of the participation process for school reform is generally leveled against the input (the quality of various programs going on in community-controlled schools) and the output (the actual educational results in community schools). But because the participation movement is such a new one, the questions of the critics can only be dealt with by assessing the programs and their results in terms of less than a decade of attempts at reforming a system that has become outdated over a period of two centuries. Quite possibly, the participation movement has not yet achieved success in input and output because it has not been in progress long enough. The only justification of the participation movement at this time rests in the new theoretical assumptions on which it is based. This is a conceptual justification.

We shall now examine both the criticism of the participation movement and its theoretical—or conceptual—justification.

CRITICISM OF THE PARTICIPATION PROCESS

The first question usually is: What evidence is there that neighborhood control of urban schools improves student achievement? The answer is that if there is no evidence, it is because there really are no community-controlled urban public schools. There are several experiments underway in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Chicago, for example, but these have been in existence for only a couple of years—years which for the most part have been consumed by the communities in a struggle to achieve some element of control from a usually unsympathetic centralized structure. Moreover, these communities inherit a failing situation. Hence they start from a minus position. However, *what we do have ample evidence of is the massive failure that the standard, centrally controlled, urban school has produced.* It is ironic, therefore, that those in control of a failing system should ask others offering constructive, democratically oriented alternatives to demand results before there has been any chance for full implementation.

The second question is based on the view that community participation is a political gimmick having no relation to high-caliber education: transferring control is not the real answer; the real answer is more money to urban schools. There is logic to this. For if all that occurs through participation and decentralization is merely a shift of authority, if all that happens is a transfer of control as an *end* itself and not as a *means* to reform, then the cycle of educational decline is not likely to be reversed. The problem still centers on the outdatedness of the educational system regardless of who is in control. Obviously, if parents, community residents, and students just sit in control of an outdated system, the causes of deterioration would not be cured. However, parents, community residents, and students who are seeking an increased voice in decision making are moving in this direction as a result of the failure of the existing educational system. In a sense, their entire motivation for getting into the act is to change the present system, not merely to acquire control.

The question continues: More money for what? In New York City, for example, the school system has more than doubled its budget in the last decade from $508,622,151 in 1959 to $1,251,153,235 in 1968. Per-pupil expenditures rose to $1,000, above most other cities and even higher than some suburban school districts. Median elementary school class size was reduced by 8 percent and classroom teaching staff increased by 37.6 percent—with no results. Special compensatory programs that increase per-pupil expenditure also fail to show any increase in student performance. The point is that a more-of-the-same approach has limited payoff, and most of the money requested is for more of the same.

There are also some real questions concerning universally accepted "inputs" that are thought to be central to quality education. For example, many argue that class size is crucial to quality. There is little evidence, however, to suggest any actual relationship between lowered class size from, say, 35 to 30 or 30 to 25 and improved student performance. Moreover, the cost of lowering class size in urban school systems is staggering. The point is that reducing class size for a teacher in a self-contained-classroom, age-graded, egg-crate school with irrelevant curriculums will have a minimal effect, because the total institution is dysfunctional. If the educational system is outdated, so is its conception of education.

A key question is: *What is the process by which a major social institution like the schools is reformed in an open society?* In our society, building a new model of education requires direct participation by parents, students, and other citizens in concert with the professionals. Basic educational reform is not exclusively a professional undertaking; it cannot and should not be so in an open society.

Another dominant question concerns desegregation. Don't these types of local efforts hinder desegregation? The responses vary but they usually start with the observation that since 1954 there actually has been more segregation rather than less. Moreover, the reply continues, there is a distinction between desegregation and integration. Desegregation refers to the physical mixing of black and white students. On the other hand, integration refers to humans connecting as equals. If the goal of integration is agreed upon, then one could argue that it is necessary for blacks and other minority groups to have a sense of cohesion and identity. This sense can be achieved in part through the control of their own institutions. Once blacks attain a status of potency, they will be in a better position to connect with white society as equals rather than as "junior members." Therefore, such participatory efforts as decentralization and community control can be viewed as necessary steps toward a further stage of integration.

Under the present concept of desegregation, blacks are moved to white areas and a kind of dependency relationship develops in which improvement is dependent upon the presence of a majority of whites. For many, this is another indication of a superior-inferior relationship, communicating once again, albeit subtly, another form of discrimination. Nevertheless, most argue that the goal of desegregation stimulated by the Civil Rights movement is quality education. That goal remains, as does the option of school desegregation, having been opened to many who had been denied this path of equality. Yet, desegregation has moved slowly at best; other options to greater education are needed. Enter the greater local control alternative.

This participation makes a great deal of sense, given the present reality. If schools are still largely segregated and an inferior quality of education is continued, the natural approach seems to be for the community to take a hand in reshaping the institution toward quality education. Many who favor greater local control claim that those who are now talking about desegregation and integration are using this as an excuse for not allowing communities to pursue the option of community participation and increased involvement in decision making.

The consumers of our city schools are demanding a voice in updating them. In so doing, they are rekindling certain philosophical and theoretical principles, which takes us to the conceptual level of justification for community participation.

CONCEPTUAL JUSTIFICATION OF THE PARTICIPATION PROCESS

The first concept concerns *public accountability and control* of education. In our society, public schools belong to the public. It is the public that decides on policies and objectives for the school; it is the public that delegates to the professional the role of implementor and reserves for itself the role of accountant. The people are the trustees of the schools. They have a right to ask why Johnny can't read. Moreover, if 85 percent of the Johnnies can't read, as is the case in most of our inner-city schools, then the public has the right and responsibility, as trustee, to supervise or monitor the needed changes—changes aimed at reducing the discrepancy between policy and implementation.

In essence this process has been in effect; black parents and community residents have been asking why so many black children are failing. The usual answer is that the children are "culturally deprived" or "disadvantaged." In short, black children are failing because there is something wrong with them. More and more this verdict is being rejected. In the absence of improvement in the children's performance, the public, united into communities, has begun to exercise its role as both accountant and trustee. Those in the forefront of this urban movement poignantly ask, What would happen in Scarsdale or Grosse Pointe if 85 percent of the children in these schools were academically retarded and if 1 percent went to college? How would the parents and community react?

Many black parents who waited patiently for improvement through such efforts as compensatory education and desegregation have begun to turn away from these efforts. Increasingly, communities are rendering the diagnosis that the problem is not with the learner; the problem is with the system, with the institution. The cry now is, "We need a new system, one that is responsive to our kids and to us. It is up to us to build this new and relevant system." Sincere schoolmen have been aware of the crises for some time, but they were and still are victimized by the constraints of an outdated system. Often the professionals become defensive, feeling that the public appears to expect the school and the schoolmen to solve all the ills of society. Many educators have tried to respond to the problem with programs of remediation on the one hand and token desegregation on the other. Both approaches were further stimulated by federal legislation, but they have been less than successful. Some educators attribute the failures to the assumption that undergirds the approaches—namely, that the problem was with the *learner* and not with the *institution*. Certainly it is difficult, if not impossible, for those trying to keep the present system running to serve also as major agents of institutional change. Other legitimate parties are needed. And surely parents and students constitute legitimate parties of the public school. Therefore, one could argue further that if the problem is with the institution, then the parent and community movement generated by I.S. 201 offers us hope for real reform.

But even if school people were able, by themselves, to bring about radical institutional change, they would be denying opportunities to parents and students to learn and grow through the process of involvement and participation. For example, through involvement, parents and students can learn more about the complexities of teaching and learning and relate these understandings to their own roles as teachers of others. Through involvement, parents and students become more attuned to the schoolman as an individual in a setting that places severe constraints on him; have a better view of program options; become more cognizant of the need for increased funds. Even more important, perhaps, is the realization that if the professional becomes the exclusive agent for reform he could be establishing a professional monopoly, falling into processes not unlike those used in totalitarian societies.

The second major concept emerging from the new participatory movement concerns the importance of *process*. Communities are no longer accepting the process of something being done *for* or *to* them—even if the product is desirable. Increasingly, the acceptance process is *with* or *by* the community, and this includes students as well. This principle is intrinsically tied to the broader self-determination movement embraced by many blacks and other minority groups.

The reasons for this shift are many, but they are not difficult to understand. Generally they are a reaction to the bitter realization that whites cannot solve black problems. Accompanying this realization is built-in distrust and alienation that come from feelings of powerlessness.

By emphasizing the process of participation in decision making, communities are employing the basic tools of democracy itself—tools that increase people's sense of potency. Professionals, including researchers, are referring more and more to the drive for self-determination as the "fate control" variable. Preliminary findings indicate that fate control fundamentally affects human motivation essential to achievement in all areas.

It is within this process of participation that students, for example, can begin to translate their concern for relevance into policy. Students can begin to legitimize educational objectives that deal with individual and group identity, potency, and disconnection—in short, humanistic concerns. Students could legitimize *affective* humanistic educational objectives, thus restoring a needed balance to the present cognitively oriented school. They can help to make the educational process more real and experiential, with instrumental links to the major societal roles—worker, citizen, parent. Community residents can lend support for more diversity in school staffing, tapping talent from various sources including the immediate community. This diversity could lead to the valuing of performance over credentials as the major personnel criterion. Included in considerations of performance is how human (sensitive, authentic, empathic, trustworthy) the person is.

Two other key concepts have their roots in social-psychological theories. The first has to do with *expectancy*. The concept that it is the system rather than the child that has failed is a hopeful concept for black parents and communities who have had a steady diet of failure for themselves and their children. The transition from blaming the client to doing something about institutional renewal is marked by perceptions of schoolmen—largely white—whose attitudes often brand black children as inferior. "After all," say black parents, "they call our kids 'culturally deprived' and 'disadvantaged,' don't they?" The argument continues, "The white professionals *expect* black children to fail, and so do Negro professionals who have been taught the ways of the system. These attitudes are, at best, colonial behaviors that have a negative effect on the motivation and learning of black children. Our children *can* learn and indeed they *will* learn!"

Attempting to reverse the psychology of institutional expectations is difficult indeed, but it is crucial. We are all familiar with the self-fulfilling prophecy—the apparent relationship between expectation and performance. We all seem to agree that a school is better when positive rather than negative self-fulfilling prophecies are made. When parents, students, and communities participate in reform, we can assume that the chances are much better for developing a climate of high rather than low expectations. Parents have an intrinsic interest in the maximum growth and development of their children. Add to this intrinsic tie the choice to break the shackles of inferiority, and the opportunities for generating a new climate of "making it" are enhanced considerably.

The other theoretical concept based on social-psychological theories deals with *socialization*, that is, the broader processes of growth, development, and cultural transmission. We have known for some time now that the major agents of socialization for the young child are his family, his peer group, and his school. We know, also, that growth and development are significantly affected, positively or negatively, by the relationship that exists between or among those major socializing agents. When there is disconnection and discontinuity between or among these agents the child's potential can be affected adversely.

Such is the case now in most urban schools: the family is disconnected from the school. Moreover, the culture of the family is often different from the culture of the school, and frequently the child is asked to make a choice in favor of one—family or school. The result is deep internal conflict. Add to this the fact that the peer group is at odds with both the family and the school (we call this the generation gap) and we get a rough picture of a disjointed socialization process. Achieving continuity in socialization seems to depend upon the ability of these three agents to become joined. A connection can emerge through the process of participation and involvement. When parents, students, and professionals join together in the common pursuit of reform, the process itself serves to cement new relationships among them. Also, each has a stake in what has developed jointly.

Still another concept emanating from the community participation movement has to do with respect for the preservation of *diversity*. When black communities participate in the process of educational decision making, they will most likely favor programs that emphasize black culture: language, food, dress, music, art, history, and so on. The basic point is that to be black is to belong to a rich cultural identity—an identity that was largely dissipated and relinquished as blacks attempted to adjust to the demands of white-culture social institutions of which the school is the most prominent. In this adjustment process, blacks were—and still are—made to feel that their own values and culture are nonexistent or at best inferior to the acceptable cultural standard. This left many blacks with an "identity" problem, a problem induced by the dilemma of accepting the culture of white society, which has discriminated against them and is, by its own admission, racist. To adjust, therefore, is to accept the very environment that they were struggling to change.

Other cultural groups are beginning to come to this same conclusion. Spanish-speaking populations, for example, are beginning to demand bilingual programs—programs that would maintain the legitimacy of Spanish, the language of the home and the culture. A fundamental issue is raised by this emphasis on cultural differences. Diversity is not just a reality to be tolerated; it is a value to be nurtured. Cultural diversity is important to the individual cultural group; it is equally important to the vitality and renewal of society itself. To be assimilated or homogenized into some colossal "mainstream culture" has a stultifying effect on both the individual and the society. Growth and development of individuals and society feed on a diet of pluralism. Diversity is essential to human and social renewal.

* * * *

Participation in urban school reform is taking several forms. The first of the patterns is decentralization. Participation under this form comes through, in part, as shared decision making: The consumers—in this case the parents and community residents—have anywhere from an advisory to an equal voice with those who are operating the existing educational system. The difference between administrative decentralization, which is established practice in many large school districts, and political decentralization (governance) is that the latter creates a new public relationship between communities and their public schools—a relationship in which there is a basic redistribution of authority and responsibility. Under political decentralization in big-city systems, for example, parents and community residents share certain decisions and not others with a central school board. The same is true with the superintendent of schools, and teachers and/or supervisors associations, and so on.

An illustration may be helpful. If, under decentralization, a local school board elected by the community demands the right to select a district superintendent, various shared decision-making plans can be advanced. The superintendent may indicate that the local board can submit to him the names of three candidates from which *he* would make the final selection. The supervisors association may demand that the three names submitted be from the top three on a qualified list. The central board would then approve or reject the final candidate. Another procedure could be that the superintendent present the names of three candidates whom he has checked with the supervisory group. The local board then makes its choice for district superintendent and submits it to the central board for final approval.

However, under community control, sections of city schools—usually in the heart of the city—*secede* from the larger school system to become *independent school districts.* As an independent district, the community is free to recruit, hire, transfer, and release personnel—the same as, for example, a Scarsdale or a Newton. Harlem CORE has developed a plan for an Independent Harlem School District, which it hopes will be considered by the New York State Legislature.

Communities that reach an advanced stage of frustration and concern over the failure to supply excellent education for their children tend to assume an increasingly stronger stance in favor of reform. Some label this stance militancy. The community begins to demand that basic, fundamental changes be made. It is demanding a relevant educational system: one that works, one that has payoff for the children. In other words, the community is legitimizing change.

The new participatory movement seems to be exactly what professional reformers have been waiting for. The participants carry with them the seeds of a new humanistically oriented educational process, which they themselves legitimize. Lest we forget, when professionals have attempted to impose a type of progressive education onto an unreceptive community, the results have been a defeat for both the professional and the concept of education. The curtain has come down on solo performances by professionals. Cooperative governance is moving to center stage, with the professionals given specific charges to provide the public with sound educational options.

A final word of caution must be written about the need for sensible monitoring of any community that embarks on school reform. Participation takes various forms but because it deals with decision making, it is political, and because it is political, there are shortcomings and risks. The objectives of participation must be directed toward *educational* ends—not *political*. Risks emerge when educational concerns are exploited for political ends. Stated somewhat differently, participation in educational reform is a political means toward educational ends.

There have been occasions when this process has been deliberately reversed, and participation has become an educational means toward political ends. There must be safeguards to ensure that the participants direct their political energies toward genuine educational ends and do not take advantage of the political aspirations and motives in any community.

Advocates of political doctrines are suspect as champions of school reform. The major safeguard is to emphasize the role of the *parent and student* in decision making rather than encourage the participation of organized political groups who can seize a situation and use it to serve their own ends. The parent's connection with the learner is intrinsic and primary, and his concern for the learner's welfare reasonably pure; the student's concern is, of course, with his own destiny, the most direct concern of all.

New York City's current plan (passed by the State Legislature in 1969) for decentralization did not emphasize the parent role, and we saw instead some political activities that have questionable relationships to educational ends. The parent role has been emphasized in such participatory community-centered programs as the

60

Morgan School and the Anacostia Community School Experiment in Washington, D.C., and in the three demonstration districts in New York.[1]

---

[1] For a detailed account of the community-control movement, see: Fantini, Mario; Gittell, Marylin; and Magat, Dick. *Community Control and the Urban School.* New York: Praeger Press, 1970.

7. Participation by the Teacher in Instructional Decision Making

For teachers to engage in their truly rightful role of instructional decision maker, they will have to be liberated from the constraints of standard institutional practice. Teachers have inherited a status and role placing them at the bottom of a top-down hierarchical flow of decision making. Closest to the learner, the teacher is farthest from instructional decision making. He is actually the implementor of instructional decisions made by others. He is trapped in a cubicle called the classroom, largely in solitary confinement, separated from his colleagues and from any process that enables him to grow and develop as a professional. Instead he is compelled to take courses of dubious benefit, useful mainly to qualify for salary increments.

As agents closest to the action, teachers are in the logical position to assume major responsibility for instruction. Parents and students would welcome this role for teachers, especially if the results of teacher effort were to develop new effectiveness in learning. To assume this new role, teachers must begin in their individual schools and involve the entire staff.

In attempting to create any participatory vehicle for increasing the voice of the teacher in instructional decision making, it is realistic to keep in mind the following criteria: Any vehicle created must be feasible and should not represent an enormous cost to the school. It should deal with substance—that is, with matters central to instruction. It must be reproducible. It should not be so out of the ordinary as to leave the impression that others cannot also do it.

How does one get started? To me, the key is to get teachers together in small groups during the school day, as many times during the week as possible. The reaction usually is, "Well, you can't do it. The schedule doesn't allow it." It is precisely that schedule that has to be examined. If the school schedule is to serve the needs of the school and the needs of instruction, that schedule has to be shaped so that it does allow teachers to meet in small groups. The purpose of arranging ongoing, small-group teacher meetings is not so that teachers can have coffee and talk about television programs or about particular students who are most disruptive. The purpose is to provide a time when professionals collaborate on a regular basis about matters of instruction. I am not talking about team teaching, but about team *planning* for instructional decision making.

The first problem is to rearrange the schedule to give teachers released time so that they can meet on a regular basis. At elementary levels, for instance, first-grade teachers can meet as a team; in secondary schools, ninth- or tenth-grade teachers could reach across subject matter areas. It is important to emphasize meeting during the school day, because after-school meetings pose an undue strain on the teacher and turn team planning into an "extracurricular" affair, not significant enough to be part of the working day.

In working out a schedule for team planning, it is useful to look at guidelines developed in places where such planning has been tried. In Syracuse, N.Y., for example, the imaginative use of special personnel (counselor, psychologist, nurse, doctor, visiting teacher, administrator, school volunteer, paraprofessional, and persons from nearby business and industry) became the key to released time. These special personnel were used to provide instruction to free the regular teacher to meet in planning teams. The secret lay in dovetailing the use of special personnel with the times set aside for team planning.

The second major problem has to do with providing direction for the planning team. Here the problem gets more tricky. What is needed is an instructional leader, someone who works equally well with students and teachers and has the respect of teachers—a teacher's teacher. In many ways, this person becomes an on-the-job in-service trainer or clinical instructor. Sometimes, the teachers themselves select one of their own staff. Sometimes, the instructional leader holds a joint appointment with a local college or university and can actually give college credit to teachers participating in these team sessions at individual schools.

It is extremely important that the instructional specialist be full-time, devote himself totally to the problems of improving instruction in the school, and work intimately with the teachers. This role is rather different from the traditional one of "helping teacher" or school administrator (whether an assistant principal or principal) who views himself as responsible for in-service education. The "instructional specialist" holds a new position, wholly teacher-centered, that deals directly with teacher concerns and translates them into constructive educational programs. His job is to help teachers break new ground on their own terms. He is regarded neither as a supervisor nor as one who rates or evaluates teachers.

As for the administrator who feels that such a position might interfere with his own, I think that, quite to the contrary, the principal actually would do a better job by organizing his staff to tackle the problems of in-service training and development. Even if principals had the time for this work, most schools lack the organization to allow them to carry it out. This new type of organization would actually release administrators to deal in greater depth with other aspects of their jobs such as community relations and student concerns.

At first, team meetings will be a new experience for many. There may be appearances of wasting time, of testing to see whether this activity is going to be another boondoggle or something really different. At first, teachers may be concerned with just getting adequate materials. The instructional specialist may have to prove his worth to the teachers by actually retrieving materials and supplies. When this stage has been successfully passed and some mutual trust has been established, the instructional specialist and the teachers may begin to move cautiously into more substantive areas. Their concern for individual students, for example, might take them to a consideration of different groupings. When they reach the stage of concern for testing out alternatives to standard processes, the team has reached the stage of instructional decision making. If a first-grade team, for example, decides on continuous regrouping of learners among the teachers, this proposal is made to the administrator who becomes the facilitator of decisions by these agents closest to the learner.

Gradually the team may begin to develop its own materials and procedures—legitimizing different educational objectives, searching for more relevant curriculums, matching teacher style to learner style.

The process of working through problems such as these offers real professional learning for the teacher. Teachers gain a new sense of potency as professionals because they actually can effect changes—that is, make decisions. They will also have redefined the school administrator's role from director to facilitator. The team planning vehicle could be expanded to include students, parents, and citizens, thereby increasing the growth and development of the major socializing agent on one hand and establishing closer, more harmonious ties on the other.

Teachers who help to modify the instructional environment of the school are also contributing to the improvement of teacher preparation. This concept goes considerably beyond the realization that teachers who engage in decision making gain professionally—that point is established. Rather, the implications extend to the heart of professional preparation itself, that is, to where and how professionals are trained.

The school environment provides a significant example of socialization for its participants. That environment is determined by the way the school is organized, the expectations and attitudes that personnel display toward one another, and the expectations that the board, the superintendent, and assistants will conduct themselves properly. Central to the conventional school environment is the notion that the quality of education is indicated by performance in subject matter areas, as evidenced by standardized tests.

In short, the day-to-day operation of the school acts as a social system, a reality context shaping the behavior of the teachers, and thereby becomes the major agent of socialization. If teachers have to learn how to survive in school as low men in the social system . . . if they are confronted with such dilemmas as how to communicate successfully with diverse student groups or how to deal with controls imposed by the administration . . . if they feel they are "at the mercy" of the principal . . . if they feel like doormats of the system (despite the fact that everyone speaks of them as being "all-important"), they must acquire skills of organizing, of making collective demands, of negotiating.

These behaviors are not acquired in coursework at the college level. Within the reality of an educational system, these become appropriate behaviors—actually and operationally—because they make sense for those attempting to survive and cope with the structure.

School personnel are easily trapped into protecting the operational procedures of the present system, whether or not such procedures continue to serve the student's growth and development. Unwittingly, they become managers of the status quo, even though they may be taking coursework that discusses needed change. The professional preparatory institutions compound the problem by requiring irrelevant courses. Yet, teachers must play the game, must get the "passport" or "credit card" that allows them increased economic payoffs and promotion. Professionals find themselves using such colorful rhetoric as, "It is our role to develop in each individual, regardless of race, color, or creed, his fullest potential."

Translated into operational terms, however, this means that "achieving the fullest human potential" equals grade-level performance as measured by standardized tests. At times we almost believe that what we say is synonymous with what we do.

The point is that the main trainer of teachers is the educational system—not the teacher-training institutions, not the trainers, not the professors, but the present system. Unless that system is changed and updated, we have no reason whatsoever to expect any basic change in the most influential phase of the training process. There is little reason to try to change professional training programs without first changing the school systems in which the actual roles are formed.

The environment of the school system is vastly more powerful than the environment of most colleges and universities. It serves us little to think of training as taking place in education courses at institutions of teacher education, or through the training and retraining of professors of education. Teacher training is part of the very system that needs updating and has become mainly a manpower funnel feeding personnel into the standard educational system.

Training does not take place in the college. Getting a degree does not teach one to be a teacher. We are all familiar with the phenomenon of teachers moving into the outdated system and being faced with a "cultural reality shock." The new teacher asks, "Why didn't they tell me it would be like this?" "Why teach me about the 'whole' child, when my function is to teach the rivers of South America?" "How can I deal with 30 children who are all different?" "How can I individualize instruction when the children are all different and the books are all the same?"

If team planning results in differing school environments, each an alternative to the standard school environment, we will have made great strides in providing *choices* for the parties of interest—students, educators, parents, citizens. If the team-planning vehicles actually produce diverse conceptions of the quality of education, it is conceivable that students and parents may find one model preferable to another in the same community. They should have the option of choosing the model most akin to their style and aspirations.

While team planning represents a small step organizationally, it represents a big step in giving teachers a stronger voice in instructional decision making at the individual school level where it really counts.

8. Model Subsystems: The Case of the Madison Area Project

One way for an urban school district to develop alternatives is to create a subunit of the large district and give it the license to experiment. This approach assumes that answers to problems of improved learning are still unknown and must be searched out. The subsystem is a search unit for the total system. It assumes that a form of intervention using a "more-of-the-same" approach is limited at best and that we do not yet know the best approach to school improvement. It also assumes that the educational process has to be updated and that one of the key factors missing from large-city school systems is a *"research and development" component*, a component that becomes the chief instrument for revitalizing an outdated system. This component can introduce new perspectives, new energies, and new actions to the total system by providing new and tested approaches for change. The model-subsystem approach usually attempts to tackle the problem from within "the establishment" and to tap outside resources such as universities and community groups. Subunits coordinate those outside resources that may have a role to play in educational improvement.

The assumption is that the school and its process are perhaps as much to blame as the students and their backgrounds. In a progress report (by a panel headed by Jerrold Zacharias) to the Commissioner of Education in March 1964, the model-subsystem scheme for big-city systems was highlighted, giving birth to the Model School Division of the Washington, D.C., public schools. Other cities are adapting this option—Boston, for example.

An outgrowth of the subsystem is the idea of contracting out for delivery of educational services. In this arrangement, a school system can contract with business and industry for the operation of sections of the city's school system. Underlying this approach is the assumption that real change cannot be made to happen by using inside resources alone. To increase efficiency and payoff, new energies and resources must be brought into the educational system.

Equally important, the contracting provision introduces a dimension of competition for services. That is, a board of education can specify what it expects from a contract; indeed, it can enter into contract with two or three different outside organizations, each one, in essence, competing with the other. The net effect of this competition could be to provide new motivation to renew school systems.

Under this subcontract notion a central board of education can ask for bids from various organizations for the operation and management of a school or group of schools in the system. In Washington, D.C., for example, the Board of Education entered into an agreement with Antioch College to operate the Morgan School. This arrangement has since been modified, and an elected community council now oversees the Morgan School.

One problem with recent efficiency models for urban school improvement is the tendency to bypass the newly emerging public—students, parents, and communities—who increasingly expect to participate in decisions on program options for local schools. As additional urban school systems become aware of the importance of the community in school affairs, we are beginning to see the establishment of community-based or -oriented subsystems. In Washington, D.C., for example, there are two community-centered subsystems: the Morgan Community School and the Anacostia Community Demonstration District—a ten-school unit. Each has a citizen's board, representing parents, students, and teachers, that effects policy for the subunit. Each has experimental status with the Board of Education.

In New York City, three subsystems were created by the Board of Education to test the results of greater community participation in local educational affairs. These subsystems include the five-school I.S. 201 complex in East Harlem, the eight-school Ocean Hill-Brownsville District in Brooklyn, and the five-school Two Bridges unit on the Lower East Side, each with elected local governing boards to oversee the education of the school clusters (intermediate schools and feeder schools).

In Chicago, the Woodlawn experimental district is a tripartite arrangement in which the central board, the University of Chicago, and the community are represented on the local board.

Another promising model subsystem development is the so-called *In Town New Town*. Somewhat related to Model Cities legislation is the option to develop a totally new educational system for a new community. In Washington, D.C., for example, the old National Training Institute site is being planned as the Fort Lincoln-New Town. The heart of that New Town is its educational system.[1] While still tentative, Fort Lincoln is planned to be a part of the D.C. public school system, with a special experimental status that will allow it to depart dramatically from conventional conceptions of education.

One subsystem that attempted to move from a standard educational process to one more responsive to modern conditions was the Madison Area Project in Syracuse, N.Y. A brief examination of this program may be helpful in highlighting the nature of the directions for reform.

THE MADISON AREA PROJECT— THE EXPERIENCE OF ONE URBAN SUBSYSTEM

The Madison Area Project (MAP) was the popular name given to a program aimed at improving the education of children living in a depressed area of Syracuse, N.Y. As such, the Madison Area Project typified the growing number of like efforts in other major American cities. For example, the Ford Foundation had at this time developed a Great Cities program, encompassing the largest cities in a conceptual inner-city educational effort. The Madison area of Syracuse, located adjacent to Syracuse University, is a typical urban "ghetto" area with its substandard housing; high rate of crime, delinquency, and malnutrition; low scholastic achievement; high dropout rate; and high teacher turnover. Located at the center of the Madison area is Madison Junior High School (grades 7-9) which in 1960 was rapidly becoming a "blackboard jungle."

Steps leading to the inception of the Madison Area Project began in 1959 when the Youth Development Center of Syracuse University, a Ford Foundation-sponsored unit created to study youth problems, asked the University's School of Education to conduct a study of the educational needs of Madison Junior High School. The study, completed in 1961, recommended the creation of a compensatory program for the Madison area schools—Madison Junior High School and its two feeder schools, Croton and Washington Elementary Schools. The School of Education reported,

---

[1] See Fantini, Mario, and Young, Milton. *Designing Education for Tomorrow's Cities.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

"The drabness of the living conditions of the people served by the school is fortified by an equally drab educational program."

The analysis called for a pilot three-year project to include specialists in curriculum, audiovisual communications, guidance, social work, psychology, and community relations. The Syracuse Board of Education accepted the recommendations, and the Ford Foundation granted $160,000 for three years to the project. The New York State Department of Education in Albany also assisted with funds. In 1962 the Madison Area Project was initiated within a cooperative framework involving the Syracuse Public Schools, Syracuse University, and the New York State Department of Education. The new staff assembled and quickly projected the objectives of the Project. These centered on raising academic achievement, reducing the rate of school leavers, raising aspirations for college and work, and enhancing positive feelings for oneself and one's group.

These represented only one set of objectives, however. Other objectives focused on the Madison Area Project as an organizational change vehicle, a semi-autonomous subsystem—a subunit that could expand the capability of a large-city system to renew itself. There was a further assumption operating, namely, that the educational ideas that worked with so-called disadvantaged learners would be equally useful to others. The MAP represented a type of research, development, and training substructure—the subsystem would experiment, test new ideas, and train personnel, and those new practices that proved successful would be incorporated systematically into the system at large. Thus, while the guiding perception of the Madison Area Project was to develop a compensatory program for disadvantaged children, a more fundamental purpose was to define an in-house mechanism for updating bureaucratic educational structures.

The MAP staff realized that as an overall strategy compensatory education had its limitations, because the continuing assumption of compensatory programs was that the standard educational process was fine, and therefore all that was needed was to concentrate on rehabilitating the learner to fit this standard process.

The top staff of the Madison Area Project began to diagnose the problem differently. They began to suspect that the problem lay more with the school as an institution than with the learner. The educational process itself seemed inadequate and irrelevant to the diverse needs of both the students and the community it served. The question then became: How can the process be modified to fit the individual learner? Under this latter diagnosis, the subsystem structure made even greater sense, for the internal unit was really gearing itself to the broader problem of institutional reform. Institutional reform deals with changing the roles and behavior of personnel, with developing organizational strategies to individualize instructional programs, with promoting greater relevance in curriculum content, and with relating the school to the community.

Programs developed by the MAP included certain features geared both to compensatory education and to institutional change. Although the programs themselves developed within the four MAP schools are not without importance, it is essential to view the Madison Area Project primarily as a catalyst for change in a large-city school system, such as Syracuse.

The transitional nature of the MAP is reflected in the efforts to move *from* one set of operations *to* another. These can be summarized briefly as follows:

1. *Change the school climate from a school plant that calls attention to itself to one that calls attention to the child.*

Every aspect of student activity was exhibited and given the spotlight in the halls and classrooms—painting, three-dimensional art, picture stories of field trips, pictures of special projects and activities in class as well as extracurricular school activities; academic work in language arts, social studies, math, and science; eye-catching announcements of field trips, cultural events, and special evening activities. Emaphasis was placed on problems of black identity. Contributions of many blacks to civilization were highlighted with such devices as floor-to-ceiling bulletin boards. A full-time photographer took photos of students in various learning situations and mounted enlarged pictures throughout the school. So reflective were the school walls of the talents, interests, and style of the students and community that one reporter visiting the project wrote, "Even the walls teach!"

2. *Change from white middle-class reading material to reading material representing all races, cultures, and classes.*

At Madison School, a writers' committee was established, made up of an English teacher, the instructional specialist, the reading clinician, and a creative writer.

Short stories were used to develop a basis for discussion in terms and values that the students understood and accepted. These stories gave the teacher and the student a point at which they could start together. That is, the teacher's understanding and frame of reference were the same as the child's and reached him. One telling example grew out of an experiment which my colleague Gerald Weinstein conducted:

> Some time after I had been asked for aid, I was looking through my materials when I came across an anthology of Langston Hughes' poetry. I noted a poem entitled "Motto":
>
> I play it cool,
> And dig all jive.
> That's the reason I stay alive.
> My motto, as I live and learn,
> Is: To dig and be dug
> In return.
>
> I made about thirty copies and, with the permission of the English teacher, took them into her classroom. The children stared at me, probably wondering what I was up to. Without saying a word, I distributed the copies of the poem so each child had one.
>
> There was a moment or two of silence while they read the poem. Finally, I heard someone mumble, "Tough!" followed by, "Hey now, this is really tough, man!"
>
> Being familiar with their jargon, I realized they had paid the poem a supreme compliment, although it probably didn't appear that way to the other teacher.
>
> "Hey now . . . this cat's pretty cool. Who wrote it?"
>
> "Langston Hughes," I answered.
>
> "Who's he?"
>
> "He's a very famous Negro author, poet, and playwright." I saw that most of the class hadn't heard of him. "Do you know what this poem is talking about?" I asked them.
>
> "Sure," they said.
>
> "How come?"
>
> "Well, it's written in our talk."
>
> "Oh! Then you understand everything this is saying?"
>
> "Sure," they said.
>
> "That's good. Maybe you can tell me then what the first line means by 'playing it cool.' " They had great difficulty in verbalizing the concept of coolness. "Are there any brave souls in here who would try something with me?" A boy's hand shot up. "Good! come up here. Now I'm a teacher standing in the middle of the hallway. You're coming toward me down the hall, but you're walking on the wrong side. I'm going to tell you something, and when I do, I want you to play it cool. Okay?"

"Yeah," he said.

The boy started walking toward me, and I said in a very fierce manner, "Hey you! You're walking on the wrong side of the hallway. Get over where you belong!"

The boy, very calmly and without raising his head, moved with deliberate slowness to the other side of the hall and sauntered on as if I did not exist.

"Is that playing it cool?" I asked.

The class agreed it was.

"I'll tell you what," I said to my volunteer. "Let's do the same thing, only this time show us what would happen if you didn't play it cool." Our little scene began again. But this time, after I had ordered him to move to the proper side of the hall he stopped angrily and said, "Who you talkin' to?"

"To you," I said.

"I ain't doin' nothin'!"

He became very belligerent and a hot verbal battle ensued.

I stopped the scene before it got any hotter, and said to the class, "Well, what's the difference between playing it cool and not playing it cool?"

Finally, one pupil came up with, "When you're cool, you're calm and collected."

"Very good," I said, writing *calm* and *collected* on the board. "Anyone else?"

They were able to supply a few more words. I then gave them a few, such as *indifferent* and *nonchalant.* They were especially intrigued by *nonchalant,* and kept repeating it aloud to themselves.

"Now, how about this word 'jive' in the second line: 'And dig all jive'?"

One pupil said, "It means jazz."

Another told how jive meant "teasing" in the expression "stop jiving me."

Then, a third boy chimed in with this incident: "I was in another city once, walking through a strange neighborhood. These guys were standing on the corner and one of them, he yells to me, 'Hey man, *cut that stroll.*' Now I never heard that before, so I turned and said, 'What?' That's all I had to do. If there wasn't a cop on the corner I might have been messed up good."

"Do you know what *stroll* means now?" I asked.

"Oh yeah. It's when you're walkin' like this." He proceeded to demonstrate. It was a walk with a limping gait or strut that

I have seen our children use many times. It seemed to generate a "devil-may-care," or "watch out, it's me," attitude.

"It's like they were telling me," the boy continued, "that I was walkin' too big to suit them!"

"How does all this show what the word *jive* means?"

"Well, I just didn't dig their jive and almost got messed up."

"Then what's another word for jive as you have just used it?"

"I guess . . . talk, a kind of talk," he answered. "This here poem is written in jive talk."

"Do you think that 'all jive' in this poem could mean 'all kind of talk'?"

They nodded in agreement.

"What does *dig* mean?" Again we compiled our multiple meanings on the board. To dig someone is to like him; to dig someone later is to see him later; and to dig something is to understand it. When I asked which of the three meanings fit best with "dig all jive," they readily agreed that "to understand" was it.

We continued similarly to the end of the poem. The final interpretation was that "to understand and be understood in return" was the poet's rule for life.

"How many kinds of jive do you understand?" I asked them.

"Oh, we understand all of it."

"Well, let's see if you can understand my kind of jive. Okay?"

"Go ahead," they said.

I then proceeded to give them an elaborate oral essay on the nature of truth, using some of the most complicated words I could think of. At the conclusion, I said, "Did you dig my jive?" They looked at me blankly.

Then I said, "Now let's see if I can dig yours. Would you like to test me?"

They responded eagerly. Expressions were thrown at me. I was able to get five out of six, which impressed them greatly.

"According to Langston Hughes, who has a better chance of staying alive, you or I?"

"You."

"Why?"

"You dig more than one kind of jive."

"All right," I said, "I think I agree with Mr. Hughes, and I feel very lucky that I do understand many kinds of talk. In certain situations I'm able to use one kind of jive and in others, another kind. But you sitting in this class have, up to this point, mastered only one kind, and one that I think is very beautiful. But it still is only one. You've got to dig the school jive as well as your own, and also jive that might be needed in other situations. School helps you dig all jive and helps you stay alive."[1]

3. *From learning taking place only in the classroom or the four walls of a school to the community as classroom, to a school without walls.*

A child accustomed to learning by living and using all of his senses actively is obliged to sit all day before a talkative teacher. Sporadic efforts to have the school duplicate life or recreate reality often seem phony to students. Appreciating this, almost all of us have tried to bring reality to the classroom. In elementary grades, who has not tried to bring in neighborhood helpers (policeman, doctor, nurse) or pets? Who has not tried to expand the classroom through field trips—in the MAP over 250 field trips were made by the three schools over a 16-month period.

Over the years, many schools have given up trying to duplicate the world of work within the school. Gradually, we have begun to realize that learning takes place in various environments found mostly outside the four walls of a schoolhouse. The cultural, recreational, scientific, and commercial areas of the community are themselves learning centers.

In this project, we slowly began to reach out beyond the school. We placed students in such learning laboratories as City Hall (where they can learn, firsthand, politics in action) and infant centers (where they can learn the principles of child growth and development and practice their future role of parent as teacher).

Today the concept of the school without walls has been advanced to a new and more dynamic stage by the Parkway Program in Philadelphia. In this program high school students select from over 90 courses offered in such "classrooms" as the Art Museum, Franklin Institute, Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia Zoo, the Rodin Museum, the University of Pennsylvania, Police Administration Building, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, and many others. The Parkway Program, when only months old, had more than 10,000 applicants. This attraction is, in part, a reflection of the new educational diet being offered in a school without walls. By breaking down the traditional dichotomy between learning (inside a schoolhouse) and living (outside the school), the Parkway Program becomes real.

---

[1] Fantini, Mario, and Weinstein, Gerald. *The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education.* New York: Harper & Row, 1968. pp. 382-86.

Unfortunately, there are few Parkway Programs around. The more common reality is particularly well described by the Parkway director, John Bremer: "Within these 'boxes,' the schoolhouse and classrooms, life is self-reflecting, with no relation to anything outside of itself, and so it becomes a fantasy, it becomes unreal. The students' learning is evaluated within the 'boxes' and it is never tested against the realities of life. It is a common feeling (particularly on the part of students) that what is learned in school is learned only for the purposes of the school. This is the well-known irrelevance of education. . . ."

4. *From institutional content (what the school thinks is important) to learner content (what the learner feels is important).*

The school has developed content that it holds to be legitimate, including basic skills and academic mastery—science, English, social studies. Usually the teacher has to "cover" this content over a scheduled period of time.

Trying to get the learner "through" the school's content becomes the teacher's major chore. He devises numerous "strategies" for accomplishing this mission. Often teachers try the technique of tapping learner interest. For example, in one class the teacher tried to make contact with the students through a discussion of "hippies," which he felt would interest the class. Indeed, the early class discussion was lively as students talked about who the "hippies" are, where they live, what they look like. But the teacher's hidden agenda was to get the class to the school's objective and time was slipping. He asked the class, "Are hippies explorers?" The class hesitated a moment. The teacher continued, "Aren't the hippies kind of explorers? Aren't they searching?" Some of the students began to nod affirmatively. The teacher then proclaimed, "You know, Magellan, da Gama, and Columbus were also explorers," whereby some of the students moaned, "Oh, no," and the remainder of the period was spent "covering" the navigational waterways of the early explorers.

This illustration is important in pointing out the difference between school content and learner content. The teacher in this case had an opportunity to move toward learner content after he had raised the question of whether hippies were explorers or searchers. He could have used hippies as a vehicle for probing such student internal concerns as "Who am I? How do I learn who I am? Who can I become?" These are more intrinsic questions for the learner and more motivational than the extrinsic school content which seems remote from the lives of many learners. Witness the following episode involving Gerald Weinstein and a group of students.

A group of ninth-grade boys refused to read in English class. When asked why, they unanimously agreed that the books we were giving them were phony. What follows is the dialogue:

Teacher: What do you mean "phony"?

Class: Corny.

Teacher: What does "corny" mean?

Class: (No response.)

Teacher: Can you give me an example of what isn't "corny"? Say, in a TV program?

Class: *Naked City.*

Teacher: Why isn't *Naked City* corny or phony?

Class: Well, one Sunday you see a kid with his mother walking to church and the next day he gets into trouble.

Teacher: Why, isn't that phony?

Class: Because he isn't all bad or all good. He isn't one-way.

Teacher: Are you saying, then, that a one-way characteristic is phony?

Class: Yeah!

(Teacher writes "phony" on the blackboard and under it, "one-way character.")

Class: If you'd give the kids in this school the choice, they'd all read comic books.

Teacher: Why?

Class: They're a lot more fun.

Teacher: But I thought you said one-way characters were "phony"? I never head of the Batman doing anything nasty.

Class: The big difference is we know the comic books are going to be phony, and that's why they're fun. But the stuff you give us in school you tell us isn't phony and it always is.

Teacher: I see . . . what else do you see on TV that you don't think is phony?

Class: *Divorce Court.*

Teacher: Why isn't that phony?

Class: We don't know, it's just that they talk like real people. That's the thing about school books, they're not about life like we know it.

Teacher: Would you agree then that another thing that makes books phony is the fact that the characters and events, or things that happen, aren't really believable to you?

Class: Yeah! ("Unbelievable talk and events" is written on the blackboard.)

Teacher: Suppose there were a science fiction story about a man traveling to Mars. Would that be phony? (Some disagreement here by the class.)

Class: It wouldn't have to be if the guy really acted like someone would act if he were really going.

Teacher: So you're saying that the situation wouldn't have to be real if the persons in it were acting in a believable way?

(Agreement.)[2]

At this point, some literary criteria—albeit simplified—were established by the pupils: "phonies" meant one-dimensional characters, unbelievable situations and dialogue. The question was how to use this concept to carry the pupils a step further. The pupils were asked if they would be interested in evaluating (on their own terms) some of the new books that were sent to the school by various publishers, so that the school would have a better idea of what might be ordered. The class agreed to try it. Soon afterwards, selections from some of the new books were read to them. It was their job to decide whether or not the selections were phony. They attacked each book with seeming pleasure. Was the main character one-way? Was he behaving in a believable manner? These were the topics for discussion.

Pupils began to disagree with one another. Each time disagreement was expressed, they were asked to quote from a specific passage to support their opinions. Granted, their language was not the most sophisticated, but the ideas that came forth were intriguing. It was quite possible for them to listen to and, in some cases, to read the most mundane of school literature because they were tearing it apart.

We felt it was a good beginning.

5. *From the school principal as director of policies developed by agents farthest from the learner to a facilitator of policies developed by agents closest to the learner.*

---

[2] Fantini and Weinstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-27.

Under standard school operation, the principal attempts to implement instructional policies developed by those "above him"—from either a district superintendent or assistant superintendent who, in turn, is attempting to follow through with decisions made by the superintendent of schools. We are all familiar with the top-down flow of decision making. Under this arrangement, the agents closest to the learner—the teachers, for example—are low men and are viewed as final implementors of remotely developed instructional policies. The building principal directs his staff in this implementation and sees himself as instructional leader of the school.

However, teachers are the professional agents closest to the learner, and as such they should be in a better position to develop instructional policies than those who are farther removed.

For teachers to develop the capacity for instructional decision making at the individual school level, they must be organized to do so. One pattern (discussed earlier) is the team-planning arrangement in which small groups of teachers are released on a daily basis during the school day to work on instructional matters with a full-time instructional specialist. The team-planning approach is both a continuous in-service and teacher decision-making vehicle. These small, intimate teams gradually begin to recommend instructional policies to the building principal who, in turn, serves as the administrative facilitator for them.

Such an organizational arrangement begins to establish a "bottom-up" flow of decision making, replacing the conventional "top-down" model so familiar to us all.

Teachers can begin to develop policies concerning individualized instruction, continuous progress, nongrading, curriculum development, and the like. They can tailor policies to the unique style and aspirations of the individual school and community.

As a facilitator and expediter of decisions reached by teachers, the principal removes many of the constraints and tensions between principal and teachers that often sabotage the usual "top-down" administrative chain of command.

As parents and community residents assume a greater participatory role in school affairs, vehicles similar to those developed for teachers should be developed by them. Parents may wish to organize into parent councils or associations. Principals need to supply educational information to these parent-oriented vehicles so that parents can receive the necessary data for improving the education of their children. Parents are also agents closest to the learner and as such are also teachers. As natural allies of teachers, parents need to be made full partners in the search for excellent education.

Similarly, as students assume a greater voice in school affairs, they must also be organized to enhance their capacity to influence educational policies. The peer group, as an agent close to the learner, is also a teacher.

One approach for connecting these central socialization agents is through the team planning vehicle discussed earlier. Parents and student representatives can join teachers in these sessions to work out joint policies affecting their mutual growth and development.

6. *From isolated self-contained teaching to cooperative teaching.*

Team planning was perceived to be one of the most significant outcomes of the Project. It was and is a strategy to change the conventional process. A schedule was developed to allow teachers to meet as teams on a vertical basis within the school day. Four teams—two English and social studies, one math, and one science—met every day. The teachers were organized into teams responsible for individualizing instruction for the 80 to 90 youngsters assigned to the team. A highly skilled curriculum specialist was provided to lead and develop leadership among the teachers of the teams. The curriculum specialist working with the teams relied heavily on an understanding of group dynamics and human responses to cues. He provided resources, teaching aids, instructional materials; he made recommendations, presented alternatives, and helped teachers to speak up and make decisions. The team meeting gave teachers the opportunity to air frustrations, to enjoy the security of knowing that others shared their problems, and to work together to develop better ideas and activities for lessons. Without the team approach, we would not have been able to bring about instructional changes in the school program.[3]

7. *From teaching geared to one learning style to matching various teaching-learning styles.*

One of our goals was to match teaching and learning styles. David Hunt of Syracuse University's Department of Psychology worked with the Project to establish in-service teacher workshops. The purpose of the workshops was to promote different learning styles. For example, students at the junior high level were grouped according to their stage of personality development.

---

[3] Team Planning is described more fully in Chapter 7.

Dr. Hunt and his colleagues developed a theory of conceptual stages of personality development. Under this theory the individual develops through various stages of perceiving and behaving from dependence and conformity to independence and connection with others. At each stage the individual is more likely to respond to an environment congruent with his orientation. For example, a dependent, conformist learner (stage 1) would respond to a learning environment in which the teacher was dominant and structured the educational activities. Consequently, what we might call a good traditional teacher style might be matched with dependent-styled learners.

Learners diagnosed to be at the independent stage (stage 4) might be matched to teachers whose style created a learning environment in which the student assumed responsibility for his own education, in which the teacher was in the background.

We are just beginning to deal with teacher and learner differentials. Today a start is being made with such efforts as "differentiated staffing."

8. *From a uniform pace and content to a continuous diagnosing and regrouping: diagnostic-prescriptive instruction.*

During the latter half of the 1963-64 school year, we regrouped children continuously according to their achievement and readiness for the next step in their learning sequence. Pretests and posttests were given to children using the learning sequences developed by teachers in math, reading, social studies, and language arts. The range in the learning sequences was from the fourth through the eighth grades. This procedure gave clear-cut goals to the teacher and the child. It is most important that children, as well as teachers, know at what level they are functioning.

With clearer diagnostic techniques each child could be given an instructional prescription most appropriate to his problem. If reading approach A did not work, approaches B, C, and D were tried until a method was found that worked for the learner. This approach, sometimes known as "zero reject," placed the burden of responsibility for failure on the program, not the learner.

9. *From a "What" curriculum (factual) to a "Why" curriculum (conceptual).*

The standard curriculum emphasizes factual skills. For example: *What* is the capital of Turkey? *What* are the products of Quebec? In this Project, emphasis was placed on shifting the question to *why*. The *why* approach is more inductive than deductive and lends itself to student inquiry.

Consider the statements: "Tokyo is the largest city in the world" and "Most, if not all, of man's behavior is aimed at satisfying his needs." Which of these facts is the more useful? Which has the broader range of application?

The first has limited value and can easily be looked up in a reference book; its application to other situations is restricted. The second statement is general and not arrived at as easily, but it has possibilities for application in a wide variety of contexts. Thus, the latter statement comprises a concept, whereas the first is but a small and specific piece of information. When the first statement is added to other pieces of information, a concept might be built, but the conventional curriculum rarely proceeds toward broad and widely applicable concepts. Usually a fact remains isolated, important only for itself, and representative of hundreds of similar tidbits of knowledge. The conventional curriculum emphasizes bits and pieces of information which, the psychologists tell us, are the kinds of information the human mind is most likely to forget unless they have some particular relevance for the learner. Such bits and pieces of information become relevant only when, in combination, they weave the pattern of an important idea or concept that has application to everyday life. Examine almost any subject matter test a school gives children, and it is probable that almost 100 percent of the questions require "what" answers. Not a "why" question in the lot.

A curriculum that is based on generalization must determine which concepts have priority. Selection of concepts should be based as much as possible on the needs of the learner; given the choice of a concept that deals with the organization of national sovereignty within the community of nations, or one that deals with the origin, expression, and resolution of international conflicts, the teacher most assuredly should choose the latter because connections with the pupils' own interpersonal conflicts can be brought out.

10. *From an antiseptic curriculum to a curriculum concerned with social problems.*

For the Project, units were developed on "Civil Rights," "What Is Race," "The Contributions of Minority Groups," "How Words Affect Us," and other social problems. International, state, and local problems were used in children's learning situations. In determining the procedure for approaching such a curriculum, it often seemed best to start with a relevant problem and let the children pick the content involved. The content we use should help children find alternative solutions to problems. Such real social problems as our polluted environment, drugs, the generation gap, overpopulation, poverty, and racism need to occupy center stage. Moreover, to develop in students the capacities necessary to deal effectively with these social realities, education must emphasize *law*. Students as citizens must be aware of the "rules of society" and exercise their "rights" for the pursuit of a better environment for all.

11. *From sporadic emphasis on ego development to a systematic approach to self-concept and black cultural identity.*

There seems to be value in having children see themselves in pictures posted on bulletin boards throughout the school. Pictures were taken of children in different learning activities. Also, exhibiting children's work and giving them opportunities to perform for public consumption put them in the spotlight. All of these activities in the MAP told the students that they were important.

Further, the staff of the school was selected on the basis of their attitudes toward black children. Did they expect black children to learn as well as other children?

In-service sessions with teachers were held in order to develop the cycle of positive expectations. The entire question of attitudes and expectations seems to play an important role in how children—white or black—view their own sense of personal worth.

Also, a program in which children succeed rather than fail has a positive effect on the learner's feelings about his own capabilities. Prior to this program, many children had experienced only failure and had come to view themselves as inferior.

A systematic attempt was made in the program to recruit black adults, professional and lay. The process of racial identification, while difficult to decode, also appears to be an important component in a balanced approach to the complicated problems of identity development. Another important component for identity development is the use of an instructional program in psychological education. On this latter point, the use of psychological specialists (clinical psychologist or psychiatric social worker) in small group sessions to discuss student concerns helps bring out into the open many pent-up feelings that can handicap self-development. Projective techniques, role playing, drama, and special speakers were used. Distributive information, films, activities, and lessons were planned on personality development, careers, and how to study. The focus of the group guidance classes was on affective concerns. This special staff personnel then used information received in these sessions as a basis for working with teachers.

In-service training sessions concerning attitudes, understandings, and techniques of working with difficult children were developed for teachers by the mental health team.

12. *From one reading teacher to every teacher being a teacher of reading.*

Reading was the most serious basic skill problem because of a shortage of reading specialists. We had to develop an all-school approach to reading. The reading clinician and other reading specialists met with teams to discuss how teachers could use their content to reinforce reading classwork and to improve a child's reading in subject courses. One reading specialist worked with seventh-grade teachers, one with eighth-grade teachers.

All classes in the school had reading every day. Pre- and post-diagnostic tests were given in the skill areas to find out where a child was and what strengths or weaknesses to focus on. The reading specialists worked with the children having the greatest deficiencies; the specialists demonstrated and assisted teachers in preparing reading instructions and advised in the use of different kinds of reading materials.

13. *From school activities without public visibility to informing and enlisting community participation.*

Much work was done to encourage parent and community participation in the life of the school. For two years, a parent organization was active in presenting programs which it requested and developed. Other members of the community who were interested in the program and its activities also participated as members. The name of the organization was the Madison School Community Organization. There was actually 100-percent participation of teachers in the community organization.

At one point an urban renewal project had a remarkable impact on the parent organization. Increased mobility out of the area resulted in a loss of key parent leadership. When parents for one reason or another did not come to the school, a "grass-roots" approach was attempted.

A "Learning Caravan" was developed by our audiovisual specialist and special school staff to present various kinds of school programs to parents and to the community. A very large, van-type truck was used. The interior of the van was used to display exhibits and show picture stories of children and teaching activities. A layman's understanding was considered, and a special effort was made to tell the Madison Area Project story in the light of parent interest, concerns, and interpretation of how the children were being taught. The Learning Caravan asked for parents' help and invited them to come to school to see what was happening. Parents were made to feel important. The Caravan was set up in many different areas—neighborhoods, shopping centers, and parks.

Coffee klatches were also held in parents' homes to make personal contact with those parents who rarely come to school. Mothers in our parents' group would invite several parents in their own neighborhood to these gatherings, or they would invite friends who had children attending Madison School. A staff member (usually a teacher) would go to the mother's home and bring coffee and refreshments. This gave parents an opportunity to air their feelings, act hostile if necessary, and question what was going on at Madison.

14. *From suburban-trained to urban-trained teachers.*

The need for training teachers to work in the schools of the poor has been a serious one and will become even more urgent in future years. Most urban schools that deal with disadvantaged children have had a difficult time recruiting good teachers, as well as retaining them once they have started to teach. In 1960 and 1961, the teacher turnover at Madison School was more than 87 percent. Highly qualified teachers were difficult to obtain and, when hired, usually left because of frustration, discipline problems, and the fear of dealing with our clientele.

Syracuse University and the City School District of Syracuse made a proposal for training teachers to work in inner-city schools. A Ford Foundation grant to the cooperating institutions brought into operation the Urban Teacher Preparation Program.

For perhaps the first time, a school district was taking an active part in training teachers other than participating in a student-teacher program. Officials in the MAP held joint appointments with both the School District and the University, and the MAP became the clinical laboratory in which the training would take place. Clinical professors with a "feel" for teaching worked with the prospective teachers. Regular training positions were built into the staffing patterns of the MAP schools.

The Urban Teacher Preparation Program granted a master of arts degree after participation in two summer sessions and a full year of work. Those enrolled in the program were given an intern certification from the New York State Education Department in either elementary education or specialized subjects in the secondary school. The interns were mostly holders of liberal arts degrees with no teacher training. Some interns taught half time (morning), received half a starting teacher's salary, and were supervised by master teachers. They also received help and direction through team planning and supervision by the instructional specialist who worked with the team. The remainder of their day was spent taking courses, participating in seminars, and studying cross-cultural perspectives. The interns practiced the skills leading to both strength and sensitivity, the two traits assumed to be central to successful teachers.

15. *From an educational enterprise accountable to itself to one that is accountable to the consumer—students, parents, community.*

Most conventional school systems are organized in such a way that they are not really accountable for the quality of their performance. Traditional schools tend to blame their product—the learner—for their own failures. Isolated from the community, schools have acquired their own internal system of accountability leaving out the consumer. As the quality of education deteriorates, the consumer tends to demand more accountability, which is in turn seen as a threat to schoolmen.

One of the first acts by the director of the MAP was to address a meeting of the parents and community representatives of the area. He reminded them of their rights by proclaiming, "If we do not produce superior education for your children, you have the right and responsibility to replace us with others who can. We are accountable to you."

Big-city educational systems are particularly impervious to public accountability. School boards far removed from the realities of the individual school find it difficult, if not impossible, to represent adequately the public interest in this respect. Recently big-city school systems have begun to consider reorganization through decentralization. Under decentralization, the educational system is subdivided into smaller districts each with its own lay board. One of the hopes under decentralization is to increase public accountability.

The MAP was a small subunit which permitted a more intimate pass at accountability, but this was only informally achieved. Arrangements that provide more formal accountability are just now being devised.

Results

The Madison Area Project was a three-year effort. In 1965 it terminated as a pilot project. During its three-year span it had begun to institutionalize some of its findings. In 1964, for example, a Special Projects Division was created by the Syracuse Public Schools, which established a broader experimental framework for the city schools. Moreover, many of the compensatory programs were transferred to the local poverty program which began to form at that time.

The test of success for the Madison Area Project is two-fold: (a) did children achieve better? and (b) did the programs developed by the MAP find their way into the overall system? The answers to both are "yes."

At the end of the third and final year of the MAP, children performed better in academic skill areas. There were other important outcomes. Programs developed by the Madison Area Project's subsystem are still in operation on a citywide basis. These include team planning, the urban teacher preparation program, the audiovisual program, and the school volunteer program.[4]

The MAP was an urban experiment. It grew out of an era in which the problems of the "disadvantaged" population were identified and treated through more concentrated educational programing. This was a period of compensatory education, of trying to deal remedially with academic retardation, poor motivation, and the like. The Madison Area Project indicated that academic retardation, poor motivation, and high dropout rates are also symptoms of the school's failure to develop an educational process that deals effectively with diversity. The Madison Area Project was an initial attempt to reform the school to fill the needs of individual learners and the community the schools served.

It was a *transitional* attempt at urban school reform. As a subsystem, its purpose was to improve the total citywide system, but communities vary in their perception of good education. Trying to improve a city school system uniformly with the same therapeutic measures—team teaching, differential staffing, ungraded programs, and the like—does not come to grips with the basic problem in our educational system: *lack of choice.* Improving a monolithic public school system results, at best, in providing a better *single* choice for a diverse population. We are past that stage in the 1970's. The crucial problem for the 70's is to develop a public school system which promotes educational choices for all.

---

[4] Bongo, Joseph. *Report on the Madison Area Project.* Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1966.

9. Toward Public Schools of Choice[1]

The aim of participation in our society is to promote *individual* choice. In an open society that values the individual, making choices from among various legitimate options of public education ought to be a right of every individual. In order to promote participation by the individual—whether parent, student, teacher, administrator, or guidance counselor—it is necessary to begin to think differently about our public schools. Let us no longer think of public schooling in all-inclusive terms, with the same kind of education taking place from coast to coast. Instead let us regard public education as a series of social institutions providing a range of optional educational programs to a diverse population—from a classical academic prep-type school, to a community-centered school, to a school without walls. Let us think of a public school system that has a common set of educational objectives, objectives aimed toward the values of a democratic society and the maximum growth and development of each individual.[2] Let us also imagine that there are *various means* to this common set of educational objectives.

Let us assume certain ground rules for making public schools of choice work. To be legitimate, an educational option cannot—

1. Practice exclusivity to deny any learner entry because of race, ethnic background, social class, or religious belief.
2. Practice superimposition in any form, by trying to coerce others into accepting a particular philosophy or practice.
3. Emphasize some but not all of the educational objectives agreed upon as central to a "well-balanced" program for learners.

---

[1] A full-length book by Mario Fantini, Donald Harris, and Sam Nash, tentatively titled *Public Schools of Choice*, will be published by Random House in 1971.

[2] For example, one could argue that such objectives as basic skills and academic mastery, talent development, emotional and social development, citizenship, etc. would be common to most people.

A public-schools-of-choice system establishes a broader conception of public education for today's society, one that opens up decision-making opportunities for all parties who have intrinsic interest in the quality of schooling. The public-schools-of-choice system is based on the assumption that a fairly *common* set of educational aims does exist (common to the major parties of interest—parents, students, teachers, administrators), but that alternative educational approaches for achieving these aims also exist. The system of public schools of choice further assumes that the parties closest to the action—parents and students as consumers, and teachers and school administrators as professionals—should have the right to make choices from legitimate alternatives.

The present framework of public education results in one, rather standard, *monolithic* approach to achieving common educational aims. By and large, alternatives are available to the consumer—parents and students—only outside the public school framework in private or parochial schools. Occasionally, by *chance*, some choice does exist within the public school pattern. This latter point requires some elaboration. The only real alternative inside the standard public school is personal—the strength or sensitivity of a particular teacher or building principal. If a consumer is lucky, he "hits" a good teacher. If the parents decide that they would like their child to be taught by this teacher, they find the "option" quickly discouraged because the present educational ground rules cannot deal adequately with such demands without serious consequences to the normal operation of the school.

The case for the basic rights of the educational consumer is nowhere more apparent than in our ghetto schools. Student failure clearly visible over prolonged periods leads the frustrated parent to seek options—options that will give his child a better chance for quality education. However, what options are there? He cannot afford private schools. He cannot move to a suburb reputed to have good schools. What, indeed, are his options? The parent must accept the standard, failing public school. It is little wonder that such parents feel alienated from these schools.

Moreover, the student is equally powerless to seek alternatives. He knows that there is only one path—and he must either accept it and adjust to it or perish.

Further, the teacher must accept the standard educational process. What options are there? The teacher is powerless to alter the conventional means of instruction and cannot seek satisfaction in other legitimate educational alternatives unless he chooses to escape to some private school. The fact is that there are many teachers who feel constrained by the present monolithic system and would welcome options that are more congenial to their own styles.

While we are speaking of teachers and other educators, it might be timely to respond to those critics who view educators as "mediocre." The gist of the critics' complaint is that the more capable people enter other fields such as medicine, law, and government, while the "second string" gravitates toward education. The accusation of mediocrity is often leveled at teachers without considering the institutional environments in which they all too often are forced to function—environments that literally shape their behavior, constrain their capabilities, and in essence force them to be mediocre. Creating optional environments, therefore, could awaken new capacities and talents in educators.

Public-schools-of-choice models open up educational alternatives that presently exist or that can be developed. Let us illustrate: One set of agreed-upon educational objectives has to do with basic skills mastery and academic proficiency—reading, writing, English, history. The usual means for achieving these objectives is standard procedure in most public schools. Each school has norms so that the first grade is followed by a second grade, a third grade, and so on. Students who do not proceed according to the age-grade-norm framework are forced to repeat the grade, and those who could move ahead of grade are usually unable to do so.

One option to the age-graded system is the nongraded, continuous progress approach. Under this scheme, the learner proceeds at his own rate, and there are no age grades as such. How can this option be made available to all parties of interest when the nongraded alternative is known mainly, if not exclusively, by only one of the parties of interest, namely the professionals? Awareness of such alternatives is achieved by reading *professional* publications or attending *professional* conferences. Furthermore, these innovations are often more familiar to administrators than to teachers. Administrators have more time to pursue these kinds of professional activities. Students and parents usually have no access to professional matters as such. Consequently, those farthest from the action are usually those who have the most knowledge about alternatives, while those closest to the action—teachers, students, and parents—are the least likely to be aware that alternatives exist. The public education system of choice would increase the awareness of alternatives for these groups.

To continue with the case of the nongraded alternative, teachers, parents, and students would have the option of continuing the present graded system or of developing a nongraded system. If in any school 10 percent of the parents, students, and teachers feel that they would like to explore a nongraded system, they should have that *right*. Under "normal" circumstances, either the 90 percent overrules the 10 percent, or the 10 percent tries to impose on the 90 percent a nongraded pattern. It is "all or nothing" on both sides. Under a system of public schools of choice, both will have their programs implemented as long as the educational option meets the criteria discussed earlier.

Alternative educational approaches need not take place at different schools; they could be within a single school. For example, if the nongraded plan becomes an option, then those teachers, parents, and students in the neighborhood school who have chosen this alternative would be free to formulate a "school-within-a-school" concept in which the principles of nongrading are translated into action. Basically, people have a right to the option of their choice. This choice process not only legitimizes an option but succeeds in making the option operational, in making it a *behavioral specimen* which, in turn, serves to *educate* other parties of interest. If the nongraded program shows better results than the graded pattern, then more constituents may choose this option; but they will do so because they have been *attracted* to it instead of having had the option imposed upon them. This process is extremely important in terms of protecting the rights of people in our educational system. At the Parkway School, the "School Without Walls" in Philadelphia, thousands of applications have been submitted to attend the voluntary experiment; masses of students, teachers, and parents have been attracted to the educational concept being tried.

Educational options may take varied forms and shapes. These can range from introducing different instructional materials to utilizing the community as the classroom, as in the School Without Walls.

Using a hypothetical school district in an intermediate-sized city that has seven or more elementary schools and a mixed population, a public school of choice might be structured in the following way:

School #1. The concept and programs of the school are traditional. It is graded and emphasizes the learning of basic skills—reading, writing, numbers, etc.—by cognition. The basic learning unit is the classroom and functions with one or two teachers instructing and directing students at their various learning tasks. Students are encouraged to adjust to the school and its operational style rather than vice versa. Students with recognized learning problems are referred to a variety of remedial and school support programs. The educational and fiscal policy for this school is determined entirely by the central board of education.

School #2. This school is nontraditional and nongraded. In many ways it is very much like the British primary schools and Leicestershire system. There are many constructional and manipulative materials in each area where students work and learn. The teacher acts as a facilitator—one who assists and guides rather than directs or instructs. Most student activity is in the form of different specialized learning projects done individually and in small groups instead of all students doing the same thing at the same time. Many of the learning experiences and activities take place outside the school building.

School #3. This school emphasizes learning by the vocational processes—doing and experiencing. The school defines its role as diagnostic and prescriptive. When the learner's talents are identified, the school prescribes whatever experiences are necessary to develop and enhance them. This school encourages many styles of learning and teaching. Students may achieve equally through demonstration and manipulation of real objects as well as by verbal, written, or abstractive performances. All activity is specifically related to the work world.

School #4. This school is more technically oriented than the others in the district. It uses computers to help diagnose individual needs and abilities. Computer-assisted instruction based on the diagnosis is subsequently provided both individually and in groups. The library is stocked with tape recording banks and "talking," "listening," and manipulative carrels that students can operate on their own. In addition, there are Nova-type video retrieval systems in which students and teachers can concentrate on specific problem areas. This school also has facilities to operate on closed circuit television.

School #5. This school is a total community school. It operates on a 12- to 14-hour basis at least six days a week throughout the year. It provides educational and other services for children as well as adults. Late afternoon activities are provided for children of varying ages from the neighborhood, and evening classes and activities are provided for adults. Services such as health, legal aid, and employment are available within the school facility. Paraprofessionals or community teachers are used in every phase of the regular school program. This school is governed by a community board, which approves or hires the two chief administrators and is in charge of all other activities in the building. The school functions as a center for the educational needs of all people in the neighborhood and community.

School #6. This school is in fact a Montessori school. Students move at their own pace and are largely self-directed. The learning areas are rich with materials and specialized learning instruments from which the students can select and choose as they wish. Although the teacher operates within a specific and defined methodology, he remains very much in the background, guiding students rather than directing them. Special emphasis is placed on the development of the five senses.

School #7. Patterned after the Multi-Culture School in San Francisco, the seventh school may have four or five ethnic groups equally represented in the student body. Students spend part of each day in racially heterogeneous learning groups. In another part of the day, all students and teachers of the same ethnic background meet together. In these classes they learn their own culture, language, customs, history, and heritage. Several times each week one ethnic group shares with the others some event or aspect of their cultural heritage that is important and educational. This school views diversity as a value. Its curriculum combines the affective and cognitive domains and is humanistically oriented. Much time is spent on questions of identity, connectedness, powerlessness, and interpersonal relationships. The school is run by a policy board made up of equal numbers of parents and teachers and is only tangentially responsible to a central board of education.

Although we have gone into some detail to describe several different ways in which schools might be structured, it should be clear that there are many more possibilities. Another variety of the same concept could include two, three, or more models within the *same* school facility. This plan would permit students and parents to choose the kind of educational environment and style that best met their needs *without* leaving their neighborhood or community. Open enrollment, an option often publicized by school systems, is usually precluded by zoning or overcrowding at the "best" schools. Where open enrollment is available, special arrangements are generally required for entrance and transportation. For those families who persist in seeking broader educational options, the choice is usually between moving to another school district or city, or changing to a private school. A public school of choice could resolve these issues at the local level, within a community, school district, or one school, by incorporating educational alternatives into the public system. So long as there are enough parents, students, and teachers who want a particular option, they should have it. The point that has to be made over and over again is that alternative means to reach common sets of objectives actually now exist. The problem is not one of necessarily agreeing on common sets of objectives, but rather of expanding the base of offerings.

We have been moving toward an educational system of choice for some time, but not a public educational system of choice. The present educational system of choice is dependent upon economics, so that certain more privileged sectors of the population have options not available to the poor. Those efforts that have been made to create private school options for the poor, such as Harlem Prep in New York and the New School in Boston, unfortunately face continuous fiscal problems.

The American tradition of free public schools is being seriously challenged because it cannot, as presently structured, deal effectively with diversity. It is a holding operation, attempting for the most part to force diverse student populations into a common mold—to adjust to one process or be branded as failures. It is time that we redefined and reconceptualized public education to include means which heretofore were not considered eligible for membership—parochial schools, Harlem Prep, the storefront, and others.

By no means are we suggesting that we replace the present educational system. The standard educational system claims to possess the ingredients necessary for excellent education and points to the millions of individuals who have successfully completed public education. The standard school is certainly one alternative to quality education. However, it is no longer a suitable alternative for growing numbers of teachers, parents, and students who need different kinds of programs now. If increased numbers of students, parents, and other citizens want options beyond the standard school and the standard program, these options need not take the form of a private school, parochial school, or moving to another region of the country. (Even if one were to move to a different region of the country, he would have to pinpoint his move to a particular school and a certain neighborhood.)

The present strategy of reform is the all-inclusive variety. While perhaps making sense to one party—for example, teachers or parents—it is usually superimposed on the wishes and aspirations of others. For example, at one time certain professional educators proposed "progressive education" as an option and tried to implement such programs; what happened was that the other parties of interest—parents, other citizens, and in many cases the students themselves—rejected "progressive education." In many ways, options have been introduced without the consent of all the parties of interest. Any new approach to educational reform in the 70's will have to bring together the major parties of interest as a foundation for action. This means that the learner (his peer group), the professional, and the parents have to be at the decision gate together.

The public-schools-of-choice system is a supply and demand model, but it differs significantly from other supply and demand or consumer models that have been proposed in the past. For example, some have proposed that parents be given "tuition vouchers" equivalent to the per-pupil cost. Under this scheme the parent "shops around" for the kind of education he wants. For example, he is free to move into a private school if this makes some sense to him. Shopping around is fine, but it is done at considerable inconvenience to the consumer. Under public schools of choice, the schools actually become responsive to the concerns of the consumer, which are translated into programs at the local public school level. The public-schools-of-choice system attempts to update modern public schools that traditionally serve the needs of an open society. Since we are entering a new period, a new age, the educational system must be updated. A public-schools-of-choice approach retains the overall conception of *public education*. It legitimizes, under this umbrella, educational options that heretofore were available only outside the public school system (or scattered by chance inside the public school) and makes them available through voluntary choice by the consumer.

We are also referring here to such educational options as parochial schools. The ingredients of a parochial education are aimed at precisely the same kinds of objectives as the public educational system; the major difference is in philosophy. The Founding Fathers created a framework that legitimized optional religions and made them free. We have evolved to the stage at which our public educational policy could very well recognize their worth.

Ironically, the possibility of opening public education to private schools appears at a time when many of the parochial schools are in deep fiscal trouble. Many are reaching a phase-out stage. The citizens who use these schools must accept the public schools as the only alternative. This process, in turn, poses problems for public schools as well as parochial. Each is suspicious of the other. There is a very complicated problem surrounding sectarian interests and whether the public schools are now at a point where they must indeed become fully sectarian. If by sectarian one means that individuals are going to use the schools to overthrow the interests of others and to impose their will on others, then sectarian schools would be dysfunctional to the basic values of public institutions that need to reflect the common good. On the other hand, public institutions are now sectarian to the extent that they represent the interest of their clients, or the interests of a technological society, whether it be the manpower needs of that society or the needs of the poor.

Schools are just beginning to develop an awareness that certain environments are positive, encouraging growth and development, and others are negative. Schools of tomorrow will help learners move toward the reconstruction of society's negative environments so that all human environments will be shaped to nurture human growth. Such positive action is what citizenship is all about.

* * * *

A public-schools-of-choice educational system would be judged by results. It would be, in essence, a performance model. As the behaviors associated with human potential are realized more within one model than another, the more successful model will be demanded, triggering a continuous self-renewing process.

The notion of free choice education is not new. Denmark, for example, has a variety of publicly supported schools called *Friskoler* (free schools). These schools have been established by diverse groups of parents in different communities in order to have public schools that are responsive to the styles, aspirations, and concerns of parents. The Danish model is also helpful for those who seek protection for the learner under a choice system. In that country all established free schools must adhere to the standards set forth by the state for reading, writing, arithmetic, and the like.

In the United States the ideals of a free and open society must be preserved. Respecting the rights and responsibilities of others, for example, cannot work if the option being promoted is based on an educational system that instills hate and revenge, or one that advocates the imposition of certain ideas on others. A public school of choice can work only if the participants accept the ground rules of mutual respect and no superimposition. While change is inherent in the free choice paradigm, it is not based on a "push others" orientation. Rather, it is based on an *attraction* concept of changeover, in which participants are attracted to those alternatives which they feel promote human development. These alternatives, focused more on individual growth and development, will tend to be more humane. A public school system of choice cannot include a Nazi school, for example, or any program that cannot play by the ground rules of an open society. Our laws protect us from institutions of exclusion, and each legitimate option will have to fall within American legal boundaries.

Public education in America has evolved a common set of educational objectives but has thus far relied on one monolithic means for achieving them. Given our diversity and the individual right of choice in our society, it is possible that the participation movement will lead beyond decentralization and community control and toward public schools of choice. When the day comes that parents, students, teachers, administrators, and other professionals can select from among a variety of educational options, secure in the knowledge that selecting an option will not be a compromise in comprehensive learning or a means for practicing exclusivity, we may find ourselves on the road to education for the 21st century.

JAN 19 1971